

*Gal 10 9 d*

A  
**DEFENCE**  
OF THE  
**VALIDITY**  
OF THE  
**English Ordinations,**  
AND  
Of the SUCCESSION of the BISHOPS  
IN THE  
**CHURCH of ENGLAND:**

Together with  
Proofs justifying the Facts advanced in this  
**T R E A T I S E.**

Written in French by the Rev. Father *Peter Francis  
Le Courayer*, Canon Regular and Librarian of  
*St. Geneviève at Paris.*

Translated into English by *Dan. Williams*, Presbyter  
of the Church of *England.*

To which is prefixed,  
**A LETTER** from the Author to the Translator.

---

*Et si hominum litigant mentes non litigant sacramenta.*  
Optat. lib. 3. §. 9.

---

**L O N D O N:**  
Printed for W. and J. INNYS, J. OSBORNE, and  
C. RIVINGTON. 1725.

*17*





TO THE  
Two Great Arbiters of Learning  
THE  
UNIVERSITIES  
OF  
*Oxford and Cambridge,*  
THIS  
PERFORMANCE  
IS  
Humbly Inscrib'd,  
By their Unfeigned  
Well-Wisher

The TRANSLATOR.







THE  
Translator's Preface  
TO THE  
READER.

**I***T can be no surprize to the English reader, to find me concern'd in the translation of a Book, upon the subject of Ordination; wherein the honour and interest of our Reformation is so nearly concern'd; and which may contribute much to undeceive those of our own countrey, who labour under heavy prejudices against it: and perhaps more upon this very head than any other. For however we may differ in other things, yet in this facts are to be follow'd, and not little, low, prejudices: Besides, having been my self \* for-*

\* The Succession of Protestant Bishops asserted, &c. London, printed 1722.

## The Translator's PREFACE.

merly concern'd in this controversy, I was naturally drawn on to engage in this undertaking.

I must acknowledge, that I was very much delighted to find a gentleman, so noted in France for his piety and learning, engage himself in this debate, being in every respect qualify'd to give his countrymen an idea of our Reformation, so different from that carry'd on in France by the Hugonots; a piece of service, which the French indeed very much stood in need of, having hitherto been lead away by the reports of weak and injudicious people, who gave such accounts of us, as were more agreeable to the dictates of inclination, and want of temper, than to truth and knowledge.

What the event of this may be, no man can foretel; this being in the hands of God alone to determine. Yet who knows what a better acquaintance between us and the clergy of France may in time produce? And 'tis more than possible that it may, one time or another, end in that union, so much, so frequently wish'd for, by the learned author of this treatise. I have always been of the opinion, that if our Church were more known abroad, her members would receive much better treatment from the wise and learned of all nations: And when men have once abandon'd their passions, truth is not so difficult to be discover'd, and consequently peace and unity restored, as some little people may imagine.

I am very sensible that we have among our selves, some, even of the clergy, that are sufficiently

## The Translator's PREFACE.

*ficiently sway'd by prejudice and passion: We have our implicit believers of Pope Joan, as well as they have their advocates for the Nags-Head story. Yet it is to be hop'd we are not, on either side, to be sway'd by men that are got into this low way of thinking; for if this be the common case of the world, I am sure it is but in an indifferent Situation.*

*The reception which this treatise has had from the learned men of France, is no small proof of what I now suggest; I mean, that amicable measures, and wise regulations and expedients, are at no infinite distance. There are two writers, who have already done it publick justice; the author of the Nouvelles Litteraires, and the Compiler of the famous Journal des Scavans. The latter is known to be M. l'Abbe Fontaine, of whom, nothing more need to be said in his praise, than that he has been thought worthy of the post he now bears, of Inspector of Divinity Books in the King's Library, by the famous Abbe Bignon, the great ornament of France.*

*We are indeed told, that we may expect some answers to this book, particularly from a man of known learning, Father le Quin, a Jacobin Friar; but I am at a loss to guess how he will be able to get over the historical facts herein alledg'd, and continue just to his own character. It is however to be hop'd, that he will take his informations from such, as are qualified to acquaint him with the nature of our ecclesiastical and civil constitution, as well as with the history of that particular*  
a period



## The Translator's PREFACE.

*period of time, so much concern'd in this debate: For as he is a foreigner, though in other respects never so learned, and unacquainted with our language, which is an inconvenience that the learned author of this treatise does not labour under, he may for this reason be led into a multitude of mistakes. If I am rightly inform'd, he is but meanly supported with coadjutors, as to our English affairs; however it is his business to see to this, since it is his own reputation, and not our cause that is concern'd in it.*

*That side of the question which this learned Gentleman is, it seems, inclin'd to engage in, has one advantage in his hands, which I think it never had before; and that is, to be treated of professedly, by a man of learning and character. Hitherto, for the most part, it's advocates have been people concern'd in low life, and unacquainted with the nature of the active part of ecclesiastical and civil affairs, and consequently unable to judge, even of the force of an argument depending upon historical facts of this kind. And indeed, upon a strict enquiry, it will be found, that the whole credit of this controversy has depended upon the reputation of a few weak, angry writers; who, in opposition to the evident designs of nature, as well as education, have intruded themselves upon the world, as great and reputable authors.*

*I know it is a mean art to despise an adversary, and it is very often a great weakness; but let any learned, judicious Roman Catholic*

## The Translator's PREFACE.

*tholick review the controversy of his own side, and I am apt to think he will easily acknowledge the justice of my observation; and that the adversaries of our ordinations, for the most part, have not treated this subject, either like scholars, divines, or gentlemen.*

*The reader may expect to find in this treatise, several exceptionable passages; and particularly the charge of schism, imputed to the church of England. But it is to be consider'd, that our author is a profess'd Roman Catholick, and could do no otherwise, without involving his own church in general, and himself in particular, in that guilt. Allowances of this kind are always to be made; for his private opinion is one thing, and the reality of a fact is another; nor is schism here the question professedly debated of. What the reader is to expect, is a just and rational vindication of our church, from the ridiculous story of a ludicrous consecration of our Bishops in Q. Elizabeth's time, at the Nags-Head in Cheap-side: Acalumny, first invented to support a weak cause, and continu'd by persons as weak and injudicious as the first inventers of it. The succession of our bishops in general is demonstrated, and the validity of our ordinal is also vindicated, with a great deal of learning, as well as judgment: The powers of a national church are asserted; and it is fully proved, that in the alterations made in our church, she did not act in the business of ordinations inconsistently with those powers. How far this may extend to other instances, is left to*

a 2

the

## The Translator's PREFACE.

*the reader's judgment to determine. The author has ty'd up my hands from writing any thing against the Roman Church in this preface; so that I shall drop all debates of this nature at present, and leave every body to determine for themselves: And I shall not enter into a discussion of particular points, not only because it is the author's request, but also because it does not properly fall in with the design and the subject of this treatise.*

*There is one thing which I shall beg leave to mention, and which I hope neither the author, nor any of his communion, will think shocking to their church; since it is only the supplying an historical fact, which I think has been omitted. The author is pleas'd to raise an objection or two in his sixteenth chapter, concerning the manner of our bishops coming into their sees in Q. Elizabeth's reign; which he owns was upon the foot of an intrusion, and therefore that they were irregular bishops, tho' not invalidly consecrated.*

*Thus he leaves the state of our affairs at that time, upon the foot of a schismatical church, and schismatical bishops, without a right to exercise the powers of a national church. But I must beg leave to observe, that this is not the state of our case: For before this, in K. Edward's reign, the majority of our bishops came into a national reformation, being headed by their Metropolitan; and consequently we were not at that time upon the foot of intruders: And the manner how we afterwards came to be put, seemingly, upon that foot, when our  
bishops*



## The Translator's PREFACE.

*bishops were forcibly kept out of parliament and convocation, is too notorious to all the world. Our bishops were illegally excluded, banish'd, and put to death in the reign of Q. Mary; and those men, whom he thinks unjustly depos'd by Q. Elizabeth, were arbitrarily, and in defiance, both of our civil and ecclesiastical laws, put into their places: So that the Marian bishops are with more justice to be reputed intruders; and Q. Elizabeth only perform'd an act of justice, as Solomon did in the case of Zadoc and Abiathar, in restoring the regular remains of the banish'd bishops to their former condition, and in deposing those who had assisted, and conspir'd in a schismatical manner, by making new consecrations, their Metropolitan being then living and uncondemn'd, and in putting their Metropolitan, and several of his college of bishops to death. This I take to be the true state of the case, which will appear evident to every one that examines into the history of those times.*

*But not to leave this matter liable to the least dispute, I shall presume to make one other observation, before I quit this head, which is this; that supposing it granted, which we are under no manner of necessity to do, that our first bishops did not so legally get into the possession of their bishopricks, as I maintain they did, and that Q. Mary's bishops were unjustly depos'd; yet since they took no care to keep up their succession, but suffer'd it to drop, the bishops, put in by Q. Elizabeth, became afterwards, upon the death of the others, to be le-*

## The Translator's PREFACE.

*gally possessed of their bishopricks, because there were none that either did, or could put in a claim of right, in opposition to theirs; and therefore in this sense at least, our bishops are no intruders; and consequently no illegality on our part can arise from this particular. Nay, on the contrary, those of our countrey, who adher'd to a foreign communion, upon their suffering their succession of bishops to fall, ceas'd to be upon the foot even of a national church: For a national church without bishops, is, I think, somewhat new, even in the opinion of the learned men in communion with the church of Rome.*

*The reader will find this treatise written with a great deal of judgment, candour, and learning. If I have done the author justice, in delivering his sentiments and reasonings, though in a style far inferior to his own, in my translation, it is the uttermost of my ambition. The author is pleas'd to pass some compliments upon me in the following letter upon this head, which I cannot with any justice take to my self as a matter of right, and which I should have omitted, could I have done it without breaking in upon the rest of the contents: And therefore the reader is to take what he finds of this kind, as the custom and way of speaking and writing in this complaisant countrey.*

*The author has thought fit to make some alterations in his copy, which the reader will find; but I have order'd, for the satisfaction of the curious, that the passages left out in the body of the translation, should be inserted*

*at*

## The Translator's PREFACE.

*at the end of the appendix. I did not think it equally necessary to insert the original of the additions there likewise, because my translation is sufficient for the English reader, where he will find them in their proper places in the body of the work. The author has also thought fit to alter the title page; for in the French edition he calls this book, A Dissertation upon the Validity, &c. but in this translation he would have it call'd A Defence, &c. as being more agreeable to the design of this treatise.*

*I have only one thing more to detain the reader with, before he enters upon the perusal of this work; which is, that the author's book, being drawn up more for the use of the learned than the vulgar, he has not translated his Latin quotations, but inserted them entire into the body of the work. I have in some measure alter'd this disposition; for where I thought a passage necessary to be translated, I have done it, and inserted the original at the bottom of the page; where I have not, the unlearned reader may take it for granted, that the meaning of such a passage is contain'd in the words going before, or following after, or that it is a matter of mere authority, and a bare testimony of a fact alledg'd.*

Paris, Good-  
Friday, 1724.





THE  
Author's Letter  
TO THE  
TRANSLATOR.

*S I R,*

**I**F I am too little acquainted with the beauties of the English language to judge of the elegance of your translation, I know enough at least to warrant the fidelity of it: I find it very clear and very exact, and that it faithfully answers to the original. This is a testimony which justice obliges me to give you before the publick; and I do it with so much the more pleasure, because I doubt not, but that the ability of the translator may contribute to raise the reputation of this work among the English, which perhaps may have no other merit with them, but that of having been form'd in the bosom of the Catholick Church. Indeed it  
must



# Lettre de l'Auteur

## A U

# TRADUCTEUR.

MONSIEUR,

**S***I je connois trop peu les finesses de la langue Angloise pour juger de l'elegance de vôtre traduction, j'en sçai du moins assez pour garentir sa fidelité. Je la trouve très nette & très exacte, & elle repond fidelement à l'original. C'est un temoignage que la justice m'oblige de vous rendre devant le public; & je le fais avec d'autant plus de plaisir, que je ne doute point que l'habileté du traducteur ne serve à relever chez les Anglois un ouvrage, qui n'aura peut être d'autre merite pour eux que celui d'avoir été formé dans le sein de l'Eglise catholique. En effet il leur doit paroître assez nouveau de trouver*  
*un*

## *The Author's LETTER*

must needs appear somewhat new to them to find a defender of their Ordinations among the Catholics, where until now they have only found adversaries. Thus, formerly to the honour of the Church of *Rome*, and in spite of the clamours of the Ministers, the famous *Blondel*, rose up from the bosom of the Protestant Churches, to destroy the ridiculous story of Pope *Joan*, to that time so dear to the reformed. Fable for fable. That of the Ordination of *Cheapside* is as much to be regarded as that of Pope *Joan*, and some of our schoolmen and the greatest part of our Divines or Catholick Priests of your country are no less attach'd to the one than the rabble among the Protestants were to the other. But at length truth makes it's way through prejudices the most ancient, and the most universal; and tho' on both sides obstinacy and prepossession should maintain their ground in some particular persons against the evidence of facts and the solidity of proofs, yet truth would not be less triumphant in the judgment of men that are well inform'd and free from prejudices.

It is only to clear up truth, that I have undertaken to write this treatise; and tho' attach'd by judgment and inclination to catholick unity, I did not think that I ought to espouse the prejudices of our divines, and to deny things that are true, because they are favourable to a church that has separated her self from us. It is even this adherence to catholick unity, that obliges me to yield to truth, since the more we love the church, the more we ought to labour to procure



## to the TRANSLATOR.

*un défenseur de leurs ordinations parmi les catholiques, où ils n'ont presque trouvé jusqu'ici que des adversaires. C'est ainsi qu'autrefois, à l'honneur de l'église Romaine, & malgré les clameurs des ministres, les fameux Blondel s'éleva du sein des églises protestantes pour aneantir la fable ridicule de la Papesse Jeanne, jusques-là si chère aux reformez. Fable pour fable. Celle de l'ordination de Cheapside vaut bien celle de la Papesse Jeanne, & quelques uns de nos scholastiques, & la plupart de nos theologiens ou des prêtres catholiques du pays ne sont gueres moins attachez à l'une, que l'étoit à l'autre le vulgaire parmi les protestans. Mais à la longue la vérité se fait jour à travers les préjuges les plus anciens & les plus repandus; & quand des deux côtez l'entêtement & la prevention se soutiendroient encore dans quelques particuliers contre l'évidence des faits & la solidité des preuves, la vérité n'en demeureroit pas moins triomphante au jugement des persons éclairées & non prevenues.*

*C'est uniquement pour l'éclaircir que j'ai entrepris ce traité, & quoi qu'attaché par examen & par inclination à l'unité catholique, je n'ai pas cru devoir épouser les préjuges de nos theologiens, & nier des choses vraies parce qu'elles sont favorables à une église qui s'est séparée de nous. C'est cet attachement même à l'unité catholique qui m'oblige de me rendre à la vérité, puisque plus nous aimons l'église, plus nous devons travailler à procurer la*  
*paix*

## *The Author's LETTER*

procure the peace and the reunion of those, whom, the knowledge of our abuses, and the odious imputation of rigour and prepossession against them, having separated from us; being indeed persuaded that we ought to be more inclined to acknowledge the good than what is evil in those that oppose us; and besides having always found in the greatest part of the members of the church of *England* great understanding, a most extensive knowledge of ecclesiastical antiquity, and a strong aversion to that total overthrow of discipline, introduc'd into the presbyterian churches, I reckon it my duty to do them the justice which they deserve, and to open the way to peace, which our posterity may perhaps follow with more success. If this attempt be imputed to me as a crime, I will not endeavour to justify my self from it; and being satisfied with having followed in this particular the spirit and maxims of the gospel I shall attribute all odious imputations which may be laid to my charge to a zeal more violent than well inform'd, and which is raised rather by a blind prejudice than by knowledge and charity.

In fine, Sir, if my work be relish'd in *England*, I doubt not, but that I shall be partly indebted for it to the goodness of your translation. In making me speak your language you procure me the approbation of a knowing and a learned nation; and in a manner you naturalize me among a people esteemed by all the learned men in *Europe*. This is an obligation which I shall be hardly able sufficiently  
to

## to the TRANSLATOR.

*paix & la reunion de ceux que la connoissance de nos abus & l'imputation odieuse d'un excez d'intolerance & de prevention contre eux ont separez de nous. En effet persuade qu'on doit être encore plus disposé à reconnoitre le bien que le mal dans ceux qui nous sont opposez, & ayant d'ailleurs toujours trouvé dans la pluspart des membres de l'eglise Anglicane, des grands lumieres, une connoissance fort etendue de l'antiquité ecclesiastique, & beaucoup d'eloignement du renversement presque total de la discipline introduit dans les eglises presbyteriennes, je me fais un devoir de leur rendre la justice qu'ils meritent, & d'ouvrir à la paix un chemin que nos neveux suivront peut-être avec plus de succez. Si l'on me fait une crime de cette tentative, je ne chercherai pas à m'en justifier; & content d'avoir suivi en cela l'esprit & les maximes de l'evangile, j'attribuerai tout ce qu'on pourra m'imputer d'odieux à un zele plus impetueux qu'eclairé, & qui est plutôt excité par une prevention aveugle que par la science & la charité.*

*Au reste, Monsieur, si mon ouvrage est goûté en Angleterre, je ne doute pas que je n'en sois en partie redevable à la bonté de vôtre traduction. En me faisant parler vôtre langue vous me procurez l'approbation d'une nation éclairée & sçavante, & vous me naturalisez, pour ainsi dire, avec un peuple estimé par tout ce qu'il y a de sçavans en Europe. C'est une obligation que j'aurai peine à reconnoitre, &*  
*que*



## *The Author's LETTER*

to acknowledge, and which I can only repay by a desire to see an end put to the schism and division. I wish the seeds of peace and re-union which I have scatter'd in this treatise may in time fructify, to the advantage of your Church and the joy of ours. The return of the church of *England* to catholick unity would quickly draw after it, that of all the protestant churches, who seem to feel more than ever, the defect of their government and the excesses of their first reformers. This is my most sincere and ardent wish, and I think I cannot better shew you the singular esteem I have for your nation and for you in particular. I am with all possible gratitude and respect, &c.

*Paris, March 14. 1724.*



to the TRANSLATOR.

*que je ne puis acquitter que par le desir de voir finir le schisme & la division. Je souhaite que les semences de paix & de reunion que j'ai repandues dans ce traité puissent fructifier dans le temps à l'avantage de votre eglise, & à la joye de la nôtre. Le retour de l'Eglise Anglicane à l'unité catholique entraineroit bientôt celui de toutes les eglises protestantes, qui paroissent sentir, mieux que jamais, le defaut de leur gouvernement, & les excez de leurs premiers reformateurs. C'est le plus ardent & le plus sincere de mes vœux, & je ne crois pas pouvoir mieux vous marquer l'estime singuliere que j'ai pour votre nation & pour vous en particulier. Je suis avec toute la reconnoissance & la consideration possible,*

*Monsieur,*

*Votre très-humble, &*

*Très-obeïssant Serviteur,*

A Paris ce 14  
Mars, 1724.

P. F. le Courayer.

TO THE TRANSLATOR

THESE PAPERS WERE FOUND IN THE  
LIBRARY OF THE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
AT WASHINGTON, D. C.  
ON JANUARY 10, 1952  
BY SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE  
JAMES M. MOHR  
AND WERE SUBMITTED TO THE  
DIRECTOR OF THE FBI  
FOR HIS INFORMATION AND  
ACTION.

RECEIVED

JAN 10 1952

P. E. MOHR



---

---

T H E

Author's P R E F A C E.

**H**OW Important soever the Subject may be which I now propose to treat of in this Book, yet I do not find that any of our *French* Writers have hitherto apply'd themselves to examine it. Perhaps they will say, that the Question is in it self too inconsiderable to excite their Curiosity ; or else that they want the Records necessary to instruct them in the Truth of these Facts ; or that they are already otherwise determin'd, by the Condemnation of those Bishops in the Reign of Queen *Mary*, which were ordain'd according to the *Ritual* of *Edward* the VI. their Prejudices serving them in the stead of certain Truth, being proof against all inquiries, and contenting themselves in this, as well as in other matters, to think as others thought before them, without examining whether they had any Reason for it or no.

The *English* Protestants who are most concern'd to defend the Validity of the Ordinations of their Bishops, have apply'd themselves diligently to examine into what is necessary for their Justification. The first, whom I find to have done this with success, is *Francis Mason* Arch-Deacon of *Norfolk*, who, in a Treatise entitled *A Defence of the Church of England*, dedicated to *Henry de Gondy* Bishop of *Paris*, has collected together, with great Variety as well as Judgment, all that can be said to be strong and convincing upon this Subject. This Treatise, first compos'd in *English*, and afterwards augmented by the Author and translated into *Latin* by a Friend of his, was answer'd by an *English* Doctor of the *Sorbonne*, *Champney* by Name ; tho' very insufficiently, the Advantage being altogether on the

B side

## 2      *The Author's* P R E F A C E.

side of the Defender of the Church of *England*. The *Latin* Edition, which was not publish'd until after *Mason's* Death, contain'd an Answer to the *Doctor*; and I do not know of any Reply he made, perhaps because of *Champney's* incapacity to do it, or for some other Reason which we are unacquainted with.

Afterwards there were other Writers, who from time to time continu'd to attack the validity of the Ordinations solemniz'd since the changes made by King *Edward*; but the Church of *England* did not want Defenders; among the rest *Bramhall* Archbishop of *Armagh*, *Burnet* Bishop of *Salisbury*, and some others since, have signaliz'd themselves in this Dispute; and who have also, by their re-examinations, put this matter in a much better light. However, as the *English* Books are for the most part but little known in *France*, and on the other side, as we have not concern'd our selves to clear this difficulty, I do not find that we have chang'd our Prejudices, or that we think upon this Subject otherwise than we did before.

Perhaps I should not have engag'd my self to dive into the bottom of this Debate, had I not been determin'd to it by a *Memoire* publish'd some time ago. This *Memoire* was inserted into a New Edition of a Book written by Monsieur *L'Abbe Gould*, intitled *The true Faith of the Catholick Church*, &c. The *Doctor*, who gives us an extract of it in the *Journal des Sçavans* of the 27<sup>th</sup> of *January* 1721, tells us, That the Author is a Man remarkable for his Writings and his great Skill in the Oriental Languages: by this description it is easie to know that Monsieur *L'Abbe Renaudot* is the Man; he carries along with him his own Recommendation, his very Name is an Eulogy.

This Name promis'd exactness, and a strict research. I was in hopes to find, in my reading him, a Solution of my Doubts, and I expected no less than new light in a Matter whereof the Author was in a condition, and had a capacity to instruct. But I was deceiv'd in my expectations: For, in a Word, how should I acquiesce

*The Author's* P R E F A C E. 3

quiesce in such Arguments as seem not to satisfy even Monsieur L'Abbe Renaudot himself; who closes up his *Memoire* with acknowledging, that if he has not produc'd Proofs sufficient to convince one absolutely of the Nullity of the *English* Ordinations, yet that they are at least strong enough to give him a just cause to doubt of their Validity.

All the Benefit then which I received by reading his Book, is that it renew'd in me a Desire to re-examine a Question which I had formerly studied; and this Desire produced a *Memoire*, which I communicated to some of my Friends, who did me the Favour to examine it, and were so kind as to approve of it.

My Design at first was to have proceeded no farther than that *Memoire*; yet my Friends thought otherwise, because they did not find but that the Importance of the Subject deserv'd a further Enlargement; and therefore I was forced to new mould what I had written, that I might give a just Compass both to the Proofs and Difficulties. And this was the Foundation of the Treatise which I now commit to the Judgment of the Publick, and which at the same Time retarded its Publication, tho' this Delay has been no Disadvantage to it; for in taking Time to search for the Materials necessary for my purpose, an *English* Author, more diligent than myself, answer'd this *Memoire* of Monsieur Renaudot's, in a Pamphlet intituled, *De Vera & non interrupta Episcoporum ad nos usque Anglorum Successione, ad amicum Epistola*. This Pamphlet, tho' very short, contains the strongest Proofs of the Validity of the *English* Ordinations, and of Remarks altogether new upon this Subject, which I have made the best use of in this Work; and the Author writes with so much Assurance of what he advances, that I could not hesitate to give my Assent to what he writes.

If the Writings of the *English*, in favour of their Ministry, were better known, I should not have troubled the Publick with a Book, which it would have then but little need of; yet I hope that I shall be indulg'd



# 4 *The Author's* P R E F A C E.

dulg'd in some measure in favour of a Question so important, and so little examin'd among us, as this I now propose to treat of. There is nothing less intended, than to know if the Church of *England*, formerly so illustrious, and even now also so recommendable for the Brightness of her Prelates, and the Erudition of her Clergy, be without a Succession, without an Hierarchy, without a Ministry. A great many of our Divines maintain this, and the *English* Divines deny it.

It is certain that tho' these latter were in the right, yet their separation will not be more justifiable, nor give them greater Grounds of Assurance; nothing can excuse Schism. There is never, as *St. Augustine* says, a just Reason to break Union. Our Abuses and Vices may indeed palliate their Schism in the Eyes of the Simple, but cannot justify it, when the Matter is weigh'd by the Doctrines and Principles of the primitive Church. And tho' they use all Endeavours to weaken the Authority of the Church, yet it is a Weight that bears them down, and gives us an Advantage over them, which they themselves cannot refuse us.

And tho' in proving their Succession, we restore not to them all the Advantages they have lost in separating themselves from the Church, yet it is of the greatest Importance carefully to display this their Happiness. How remote soever we may at present be from each other, our re-union is not impossible. Of all the Churches which have broke the Unity, the Church of *England* has kept nearest to us; she has retain'd a considerable Part of our Customs and Ceremonies: And if some Divines labour'd with the same Industry to reunite Mens Minds, and to suppress the Seeds of Division, as they do to stir them up, in order to widen the Breach, and heighten the Dispute, I doubt not, but that in our own Days we might see an end put to the Schism, and in consequence the return Peace, and the Blessings of Truth and Charity.

This

## The Author's PREFACE. 5

This is my View in examining this important Affair; and as our Authors have hitherto been inclining to the other side of the Question, the World will doubtless be much surpriz'd that I should abandon them, and undertake the Defence of the Church of *England*: But Truth ought to prevail over the strictest Ties whatsoever, and we ought to have no other View in all our Inquiries, than to seek and imbrace her. And yet the Opinion which I have espoused, is not so new nor so surprising; for we can produce the most unexceptionable Authority to allay and calm the Scruples of some Divines. The learned Bishop of *Meaux*, *Jacques Benigne Bossuet*, whose Zeal and Erudition have been so long the Wonder and Admiration of all *France*, was much inclined to this Side of the Question: For in a Letter written to D. *Jean Mabillon*, dated the 29th of *August*, 1685. (the Original whereof was communicated to me by D. *Vincent Thuillier*, a learned *Benedictine* of my Acquaintance) he delivers his Thoughts very clearly; "As to the Affair of *England*, says he, "besides the Doubt concerning their first Bishops, who "were the Broachers of the Schism, there is a great "one arises from the Time of *Cromwell*; at which "Time it is pretended that there was an Interruption in their Ordination. The *English* maintain the contrary; and as to the Succession at the beginning of the Schism, they advance that there is not the least Difficulty; and herein they seem to be in the "right."

This Authority alone deserves a particular Attention, and gives us to understand, that they conceiv'd Hopes of re-uniting the two Churches; and if the major Part of our Divines did not give into these Views, but unwarily condemn'd the Validity of the *English* Ordinations, it was because they never seriously examined the State of the Question, but were rather byass'd by Prejudice and Numbers, than by any true Knowledge of the Affair. The Fear alone of seeming to patronize Schism and Heresy, at cer-

## 6 *The Author's* PREFACE.

tain Times, is sufficient to divert an *Examen* of Facts from whence great Lights might be drawn; and at a Season so favourable to Prejudices and Error, it is no wonder that false Opinions run on in their Carriere, and by a sort of Tradition assume an Air of Authority, which is the Characteristick of Truth it self.

I have taken this Task upon me, purely to find out the Truth, and by this Means the more speedily to bring the Schism to a Period. Re-ordinations have always carried along with them something odious in the Face of the Church; and as Men by Degrees came to reason about Divinity by Principles, the Difficulties about the Ordinations of Hereticks and Schismatics, were very much abated. At last this was laid down as an undoubted *Maxim*, That those Ordinations, where the essential Parts were observed, should be accounted valid, by reason of the Character which is indelible.

This therefore is the Crisis to which we must reduce all that we have to discuss in this Treatise. The Importance of the Affair obliges me to act herein with all the Exactness and Impartiality that I possibly can. It is certain that the Advantages which would arise from the re-union of the Church of *England* with us, ought naturally to incline us to favour all that may contribute to the Validity of their Ministry. But as in the Consideration of Facts we ought to have Recourse only to what establishes or destroys the Truth of them, we must therefore lay aside all Thoughts of Prejudice and Interest, to take a clearer View of the Evidence and Solidity of the Proofs.

In order to treat this Subject more methodically, I shall first set forth the Changes that happen'd in the Church of *England* with regard to the Succession of their Bishops, and their Ordinations. I shall afterwards prove, that notwithstanding the Changes introduc'd by *Edward* the VI<sup>th</sup> in the Ordinal, there was nothing essential omitted in *Parker's* Consecration, who is the Source and Origin of the *English* Ministry, as it  
subsists



## *The Author's* P R E F A C E. 7

subsists at this Day. I shall in the Chapters that follow prove the Certainty of *Barlow's* Consecration, upon which that of *Parker's* depends: And I shall endeavour to refute all the Arguments brought against it. In fine, in discussing some general Difficulties propos'd against the Validity of the new Ordinations, I shall lay down Principles and Maxims which will not only conduce to establish the *English* Ordinations, but also to remove all Doubts that may happen of this kind. I shall moreover examine, with a great deal of Caution, what Authority a national Church can challenge in what concerns the Administration of the Sacraments: and I hope to make it very evident, that the Church of *England* has not exceeded the Bounds of her Power in those Alterations she thought fit to make in her Rites. By an Examination of all these Facts, and these Principles, it will be easy to pass a Judgment upon the Practice of several Bishops who re-ordain the *English*; and I believe it will plainly appear, by the Proofs we shall have produced, that this Custom clashes with the receiv'd Maxims of the Church upon this Head, and that it is founded only upon chimerical Facts, upon Opinions that are abandon'd, and upon Doubts that have no Foundation.

I have made it my particular Care through this whole Dissertation, to advance nothing without Proof. The Pieces which I have caused to be printed at the End of this Treatise, will be my Vouchers for the Truth of my Facts. Where printed Books are deficient, I have had recourse to the Archives, and tho' not by my self, yet by Persons of great Distinction, who have the Privilege of consulting every where, and who were willing to forward my Designs in this Affair. The Fragments of some Letters which they honoured me with, and which I have inserted among my Proofs, should be considered as original Acts, the Citations being copy'd out of the Registers. I have suppress'd the Authors Names, not so much because I had an Inclination to appropriate their Labours to

B 4

my

my self, as to pay a Deference to their own Modesty. My Silence on the other side is an intire Loss to me, since their Correspondence would reflect Honour on me, and I should receive from the Character which they bear, and which they oblige me to suppress, an agreeable Return apt to create in me a self Love. The Truth is, I have spared neither Pains nor Friends in order to be inform'd, and to avoid my being mistaken.

I dare flatter my self the more, because I had neither Prejudice nor Interest in examining this Question. I may be deceived as well as another, and perhaps easier than another Man; but the World may depend upon a docil Disposition in me, if any one convinces me that I have been mistaken; and I shall esteem it it as great an Honour to retract my Error, as to find out the Truth: Yet far from apprehending any Mistake, I invite all those to write that are well vers'd in this Affair; and so long as Charity and a just Decorum is observed, this Dispute can only tend to make the Truth triumphant. But what those of different Sentiments are principally to regard, is not to pretend to confute me by odious Consequences or endless Objections. One ought to confine himself, as I have done, to Matters of Fact, and not call in Theology to his Relief any further than some Principles which are necessary to make an Application; any other Method will be out of the Way; and I declare before hand, that I do not pretend to give Weight to odious Suspicions, by removing them, nor to follow endless Digressions, whereby the Subject of the Debate would be intirely lost.

I am not led by Conjectures, nor by Sallies of Imagination; Facts only require Fidelity, which I have persu'd to a Scruple. I have advanc'd nothing but upon the Authority of contemporary Witnesses, or of Authors that have examin'd the Registers themselves. One may reasonably rely upon the Fidelity of the *Eng-*  
*lish,*

## *The Author's* PREFACE. 9

*list*, who make no Difficulty to publish what is against them, as well as what is in their favour.

It is not necessary that I should tell the World the Reasons that retarded the Publication of this Work, which was finished long ago; it is a Mystery that concerns no body but the Author; that which is most material, is that it may prove useful now it is published. The Impatience caus'd by the Delay, and the Novelty of the Subject, promises me all the Success imaginable, if I could but flatter my self that I have not weaken'd the Truth by my Defects. It is the Publick that is to determine, whose Judgment I do not decline; for which way soever it be, their Approbation will either confirm me in the Truth, if I have found it, and their Censure will confute me if I have deviated from it.

But in short, that no body may be at the trouble to search elsewhere for the *Memoire*, to which this Treatise is an Answer; and that there may be no room left to imagine it is misrepresented, in order to its being more easily refuted, I have judg'd it necessary both for the Reader's Convenience, and my own Justification, to have it printed at the beginning of this Dissertation, as it is published in Monsieur *L'Abbe Gould's* Book. That pious and zealous Author will not accuse me of having conceal'd the Difficulties contain'd in this *Memoire*. All that he can complain of, is that I have made Monsieur *L'Abbe Renaudot* the Author of it: But even in this Particular, he ought rather to complain of the Authors of the *Journal des Sçavans*, since it was they that acquainted the Publick with this Circumstance, and I have a right to presume that they would not have done it without some Reason or Knowledge of the Matter.

T H E



---

THE  
MEMOIRE  
OF  
*Monsieur L'Abbe* RENAUDOT  
UPON THE  
Validity of the *English* ORDINATIONS ;

Extracted out of a Book written by Monsieur L'Abbe Gould, intituled, *The true Faith of the Catholick Church, &c.* Printed at Paris by J. B. Coignard. Edit. 1720.

THAT which ought to be yet still more convincing, that the surest way to Salvation is to be in Communion with the *Roman* Church, is that the lawful Ordination communicated by *Christ Jesus* to his Apostles and their Successors, is no where to be met with but in that Church, as the Protestants themselves acknowledge, since they have sometimes endeavoured to steal an Ordination from us. The *Bohemian* Brothers have formerly attempted it; and are we not apprised that Queen *Elizabeth* of *England*, not being able to find any Catholick Bishop who was inclined to consecrate *Parker*, whom she had made Archbishop of *Canterbury*, us'd all manner of Means to oblige my Lord *Richard Creagh* Archbishop of *Armagh*, and Primate of *Ireland*, then a Prisoner in the Tower of *London*, to consecrate him? but that holy Prelate chose rather to languish

languish under the Chains of his Prison, than to purchase his Liberty by committing so horrid a Sacrilege.

*Matthew Parker* was nominated to the Archbishoprick of *Canterbury* in 1559, by Queen *Elizabeth*, who was inclin'd to have him consecrated by a Catholick Bishop. The rest of the new Bishops she would also have had to be ordained after the same manner, to the end that, in consequence of such a Consecration, the Validity of their Ordination should not be called in question. To this purpose, there was a Commission directed to *Gilbert* Bishop of *Bath*, to *Cuthbert* Bishop of *Durham*, *David* Bishop of *Peterborough*, *Anthony* Bishop of *Landaff*, to *Scory* and *Barlow*, who are styl'd Bishops, but without notice taken of their Sees; which makes it credible that they were not consecrated. The three first refused to consecrate *Parker*. Upon this *Elizabeth* directed a second Commission to *Barlow*, to *Anthony* of *Landaff*, to *Scory*, to *Coverdale*, to two Suffragans, and to *Bale* Bishop of *Offory* in *Ireland*. The Bishop of *Landaff* refused to act, tho' he had taken the Oath of Supremacy; and in short, after several Difficulties, it was *Barlow* assisted by *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskins*, that consecrated *Parker* on the <sup>a</sup> 6<sup>th</sup> of *December* 1559, and *Parker* afterwards ordained all the rest, from whom the Church of *England* derives her Ordination.

The Consecration of *Parker* was immediately disputed against by the Catholicks, who demonstrated the Nullity of it by several substantial Arguments; and some Persons, as ocular Witnesses, asserted that it was perform'd in a Tavern. The Protestants defended themselves but very insufficiently from this Accusation, which was objected to them at that very Time, or some few Years afterwards, by several Catholicks; and some of them had nothing else to say for themselves, but that the way of Ordination practis'd to that Time was not at all necessary. In a Word, it was only in

<sup>a</sup> The Author of the Memoire is mistaken; *Parker* was not consecrated until the 17<sup>th</sup> of *December*.

the Year 1616<sup>b</sup> that *Mason* having undertaken to draw up an Apology for the *English* Ordinations, cited the Register at *Lambeth*, wherein was contained an Account of *Parker's* Ordination. *Burnet* and *Collier*, who have written since, have publish'd it as an authentick Record, to refute the Story of the Tavern, and at the same time to prove that the Ordination of *Parker* was perform'd in Form; altho' this very Record, such as they have publish'd it fifty Years afterwards, proves quite the contrary.

For, first, it proves that *Barlow* was the consecrating Bishop; and it does not appear that he was consecrated himself. It is true that he was nominated to several Bishopricks, but *Mason* owns that he could not find the Record of his Ordination in *Cranmer's* Register, tho' he found all the rest exactly set down there, and even their Translations. *Godwin*, a very faulty Author, says positively, but without Proof, that *Barlow* was consecrated in 1535. but this Assertion is destroyed by undisputable Proofs; for *Rymer* has since published, among his Records taken out of the *English* Archives, a Commission of Queen *Elizabeth's* directed to *Parker* to consecrate *Barlow* as Bishop of *Chichester*, and another to consecrate *Scory*, who was also one of the assisting Bishops. The Bishop of *Landaff* refus'd to consecrate *Parker*, because *Bonner* Bishop of *London*, and then a Prisoner and depos'd, signified to him that he would excommunicate him if he presum'd to perform that Office. *Bonner* would have sent the same Message to *Barlow*, if he had look'd upon him to be a Bishop.

This same *Bonner* was molested in 1564, by *Horn* Bishop of *Winchester*, who had been ordain'd by *Parker*, because he refus'd, even to that Time, to take

<sup>b</sup> Another Mistake, *Mason's* Book was first published in 1613. and there was no Edition publish'd in 1616. This shews how well qualified this Writer was to engage in this Subject, when it appears he had not so much as consulted the Books that treat of it, but writ by Hearsay only.



the Oath of Supremacy. He answer'd no otherwise than that it was *Horn's* Business, as well as that of the other Bishops, to prove that they were Bishops. The Judges would determine nothing, and the Affair was laid before the Parliament, who declar'd that those Persons ordained by King *Edward* the VI<sup>th</sup> Ordinal were true Bishops, but the Indictment against *Bonner* was dropp'd.

This same *Lambeth* Register supplies us with another Proof, which is of no less Force against the Validity of *Parker's* Ordination; which is, that he was ordain'd by King *Edward's* Ordinal, and every body must agree that this Form is intirely defective, for it is drawn up after this manner: Take the holy Ghost, and remembze that thou stirre up the Grace of God whiche is in thee by Imposicion of Handes: For God hath not geven us the Spirite of Fear, but of Power, and Love, and of Sobernes. It cannot be proved that ever any Church ordain'd Bishops after this manner; for this Form accords as well to the Ordination of Priests, as to that of Bishops; which was the Reason that at the Restoration of King *Charles* the second, there were some Words added to distinguish the Priesthood from Episcopacy. But as the *English* Catholick Divines have most judiciously observed, that a Form, unknown to the whole *Latin* Church, ancient as well as modern, of which there are no Footsteps in the Pontificals of all Christian Countries, cannot be look'd upon as valid.

So that if there remains but one Doubt so well grounded as this, there is neither a Priest nor Bishop in *England*, ordain'd in this manner, that can be assured of his Ordination: Forasmuch as since the beginning of *Henry* the eighth's Schism, tho' he made no Alterations in the Administration of the Sacraments, yet *Cranmer* and his Adherents were consulted with upon several Articles. The eleventh was, *Whether Ordination of Priests and Bishops was necessary?* *Cranmer* and *Barlow* said it was not, and that the Appoint-  
ment

ment of the Prince was sufficient. Yet while this Prince liv'd, there was no Consecration made but according to the *Roman Pontifical*; for which Reason the Catholicks made no Difficulty to acknowledge those for Priests and Bishops, who were ordained after this manner. If some have pretended a Defect of Power, because they receiv'd it from the King, has render'd the Ordination invalid; yet this Opinion was not approved of by the rest, since it only proves the Illegality, and not the Nullity of the Ordination: This was likewise the Judgment of Cardinal *Pool*, whose Capacity the World is very well apprised of: For in the Reign of Queen *Mary*, he and the rest of the Catholick Bishops, as well as several able Divines ordain'd, that the Priests and Bishops who would re-unite themselves to the Catholick Church, should be restor'd to their Functions, provided they had been ordained by the *Roman Pontifical*; and that those who had been ordained by King *Edward's* Ritual, should be re-ordained in case they were found worthy of it. Conformably to this Resolution, those who were condemn'd to die as Hereticks, were not degraded but of those Orders only which they received by the *Roman Pontifical*, the others were look'd upon as Laymen.

What then can this Succession be, so much boasted of by the *English Church*; against which there are Doubts so strong and pressing, that they cannot be answer'd? Insomuch that there is no Communion separated from that of *Rome*, against which the same Objections can be rais'd. The Succession of the Bishops of the *Greek Church* is very well attested, and no reasonable Difficulty can be rais'd against the Validity of their Ordinations. The *Copticks* of *Alexandria* have had their Bishops ordain'd by *Dioscorus* and his Successors. The *Syrian Jacobites*, and the *Nestorians*, prove also the same Succession of Episcopacy among them; and as their Offices of Ordination are the same with the *Greeks*, none can dispute their Authority. In fine, we meet, in the History of the Church

Church of *Alexandria*, with something that resembles the *English* Ordinations, which makes it appear that those People, amidst all the Evils they endur'd from the Infidels, had neither forgotten nor despised the ancient Doctrine and Discipline of the Church. The *Ethiopians* were without Priests, by reason of the long Vacancy of the Metropolitan See, and the King obliged one of those that remain'd, to execute the Office of a Metropolitan, and to perform Ordinations; which the Patriark of *Alexandria* declared null. This King had the same Authority with *Henry* the Eighth and *Edward* the Sixth, and yet a greater according to *Monfieur Ludolph*, who certainly is mistaken: He had much more Reason of his Side than the two former; nevertheless the Church of *Alexandria* look'd upon these Ordinations, as the Catholicks do upon that of *Parker*.

Such is the Original of the Ordinations of all the Bishops and Priests in *England*. Now to establish the Validity of it which was contested, because the Acts relating to Religion passed by *Edward* the Sixth were repeal'd by *Queen Mary*, there was an Act made in the eighth Year of *Elizabeth*, by which that Act which establish'd the Ordinal was reviv'd. This Act rectify'd all that was defective in the said Form; which Form, as null as that which they rectify'd, is the Foundation of the *English* Ordination.

The Catholick Doctors of that Age, as well as since, in vain reproach'd in their Writings the Church of *England* with the Nullity of an Ordination so irregular; in vain did they press them to name the Bishop who consecrated *Parker* and the rest, and to tell in what Place they were consecrated. They kept a profound Silence upon this Subject for the Space of fifty four Years.

So that the Validity of the Ordination of the whole Protestant Clergy of *England*, as it appears by the 36<sup>th</sup> Article of their Confession is founded only upon an Act of Parliament, and upon *Queen Elizabeth's* Dispensa-



Dispensation; and this being so, must it not necessarily be granted, that this Church is intirely destitute of a lawful Succession and Ordination.

But what is yet more remarkable, is that the very Objections rais'd against these Gentlemen upon the Subject of the Nullity of their Ordinations, they themselves also make to the *French Calvinists*; since they do not receive their Ministers among them to preach, or to do any other Ecclesiastical Function, but ordain them anew, as if they had no Character before. They do not observe the same Conduct as to the apostate Priests and Monks of the Catholick Church; they receive them joyfully, and with open Arms, if they can but shew authentick Letters of their Orders.



---

---

A  
D E F E N C E  
O F T H E  
V A L I D I T Y  
O F T H E  
*English* O R D I N A T I O N S, &c.

---

C H A P. I.

*An History of the Changes that happen'd in  
England since the Reformation, in the Ad-  
ministration of Orders.*

**I**T is well known upon what occasion *Henry* the eighth separated himself from the church of *Rome*. The <sup>a</sup> divorce of that Prince from *Queen Catharine*, and his marriage with *Ann of Bolleyn*, is the beginning or *epocha* of that sad event. The *English* themselves are not fond of it, and have no other refuge to cover a beginning so inauspicious, than the saying of *St. Augustine*, viz. *That God can cause the greatest good to spring from the greatest evil*. It is not my business here to examine whether this maxim be just-

<sup>a</sup> The sentence of divorce was pronounced by *Cranmer* in 1533.

ly apply'd ; but what is certain is this, that the separation of that Prince, even in an instant, drew his whole kingdom after him, and, by an untoward influence, was copied by *Scotland* and *Ireland* ; which, in a little time, ended in the repeal of the ancient Laws, and of all subordination to a lawful authority.

I here confine my self to what regards their Ordinations. The innovations began in the year 1533, which was the first year of the Schism ; but yet when *Henry* separated himself from the church of *Rome*, he was firmly attach'd to her doctrine, and a declared enemy to the new opinions. The innovations were very inconsiderable in his time, and he contented himself in his reign with abolishing out of the Ordinal the oath of obedience which the Bishops made to the Pope at their Ordination. In this change all the rites and ceremonies prescrib'd by the *Roman* Ritual, were religiously conserv'd. <sup>b</sup> *Henry the eighth*, says *Sanders*, ordain'd that no person being a Bishop elect, should hunt after Bulls, or apostolical Mandates from the Pope, concerning Consecration, but only exhibit the royal Mandate ; by Authority whereof, being ordained by three Bishops, with the consent of the Metropolitan, according to an act of parliament then made, and in imitation of the ancient Canons, he was to be accepted as a true Bishop ; nor was any body otherwise ordain'd, to be acknowledged as such ; yet the ceremonial and solemn unction were still retained according to ecclesiastical usage. And indeed by the statute of the 25<sup>th</sup> year of *Henry VIII.* it is order'd, that the Archbishops or Bishops, when the King's Patent was address-

<sup>b</sup> *Henricus VIII. decrevit ne quisquam electus in episcopum Bullas Pontificias seu mandatum Apostolicum de consecratione requireret, sed regium tantum diploma adferret, secundum quod, a tribus episcopis, cum consensu metropolitæ ordinatus, jubebatur lege comitiorum, facta ad imitationem antiquorum canonum, esse verus episcopus ; nec alio modo ordinatum pro episcopo agnosci oportere ; ceremoniam autem & solemnem unctionem more ecclesiastico adhuc in consecratione illa adhiberi voluit. Sand. de Schism. Angl. lib. 3. pag. 348.*

<sup>c</sup> *Statutes at large, Tom. I. p. 425.*



fed to them for the consecration of any Bishop, were to proceed in that Office with using all the benedictions and ceremonies requisite in that case. So that at that time there was nothing practised different from the *Roman Pontifical*; and it does not appear during all his reign, that there was scarce any innovation in this office, tho' it is one of the most solemn in the church.

But under *Edward* the sixth, things did not rest here; he abolish'd the *Roman Pontifical*, and substituted in the room of it, a form of Ordination altogether new, which was publish'd by the authority of parliament in 1549<sup>d</sup>. In 1552, this Ordinal was annex'd to the book of *Common-Prayer*, and the parliament authorised it anew<sup>e</sup>. This statute was repeal'd in the first year of the reign of Queen *Mary*<sup>f</sup>, who restor'd the use of the *Roman Pontifical* in the Ordination of Bishops; but this practice continu'd only during the reign of that Princess: For one of the first things Queen *Elizabeth* did, as soon as she ascended the throne, was to put matters upon the same footing as they were in the days of King *Edward*; and in order to this, her first parliament, held in the year 1559<sup>g</sup>, restored the Book of *Common-Prayer*, to the same authority which it had under that Prince. This statute was confirm'd in the year 1566, and at the same time all the Ordinations perform'd under *Elizabeth*, according to the Ritual of *Edward* the sixth, were declar'd legal. This statute is very clear and plain with respect to the new form of Ordination, which was thus confirm'd and ratify'd with such solemnity<sup>h</sup>.

The Revolution, which was brought about by the rebellion against King *Charles* the first, introduc'd a change of discipline in the kingdom. The 26<sup>th</sup> of

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. p. 674. Heylin's *hist. of the Reformation*, p. 83. Both Statutes here cited are in the Appendix.

<sup>e</sup> Statutes at large, tom. i. p. 676.

Heylin's *Hist. of Reformat.* p. 198.

tom. i.

<sup>h</sup> Ib. p. 816.

<sup>f</sup> Ib. p. 709. and

<sup>g</sup> Stat. at large, p. 763.

20 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

January 1643<sup>i</sup>, a bill was pass'd in the House of Lords for the abolishing of *Episcopacy*; and in 1646, this abolition was confirm'd by an ordinance of both houses. However this change continu'd but a little while; it ended with the death of *Cromwell*; for one of the first cares of King *Charles the second*, was to restore the usages which were practis'd before the troubles began, and he gave a commission to some Bishops and several Divines to review the book of *Common-Prayer*, and the form of *Ordination*; which book and form, together with the corrections and additions which were pass'd in Convocation, were approved by Parliament in 1662<sup>k</sup>. And this is the last period wherein any variations happen'd upon this head; for since that time, that church has always conform'd to the Ordinal as settled in the time of King *Charles the second*.

How considerable soever these innovations may appear, they are nothing in comparison to what pass'd in *Scotland*: The *Presbyterian* government prevail'd in that church, and these reformers introduc'd, together with the doctrine of *Calvin*, all the maxims and discipline of *Geneva*. They established, in the year 1560, Elders, Presbyters, and Deacons; and, according to the Example of the *Lutherans* in *Germany*, a species of Bishops also, whom they styl'd *Superintendants*. The articles of *ecclesiastical Polity*, dress'd up by *John Knox*<sup>l</sup> a Presbyterian, were presented to the assembly held in the month of *January* 1561, wherein there is mention made of the Election and Ordination of *Superintendants*, *Presbyters*, *Deacons*, and *Elders*; and tho' they still preserv'd the imposition of hands, yet they did not repute it as a thing necessary: But these articles were never ratify'd, yet it was by their private authority, that the new Ministers established their new discipline in *Scotland*.

<sup>i</sup> *Life of William Laud*, p. 200. *Collier's Hist.* p. 821, 848.

<sup>k</sup> *Statutes at large*, tom. 1. p. 1198.

<sup>l</sup> *Calderwood's Hist. of the Church of Scotland*, p. 25. *Spotswood's Hist. of the Church of Scotland*, p. 152.

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 21

In the year 1572<sup>m</sup>, they were willing to establish a certain fix'd form of discipline, and to enlarge a little more the power of the *Bishops*, which was what the *Presbyterians* did not like; and, says *Calderwood*, *This is the first sort of Bishops which they introduc'd into our reformed church.* But this kind of establishing Episcopacy did not continue long; for as the same author observes, <sup>n</sup> *They were not permitted above three or four years, and the same assembly would give no positive approbation to this book of discipline, which was referr'd to the judgment of Commissioners.* In a word, by the book of discipline presented to the Parliament of *Scotland* in 1578; one may plainly perceive they drove at nothing but mere *Presbyterianism*, and only retain'd the name of *Bishops*<sup>o</sup>; for it was the imposition of the hands of the *Elders* which they required in the election of their Ministers, and they order'd that the *Bishops* should be subject to the *Presbytery*; and that they should not perform any function, but what should be given them in charge by the church<sup>p</sup>. This discipline was compleatly established at *Edinburgh* in 1581, and it was this year the *Presbyterian Form* was first established by law<sup>q</sup>.

Under the shadow of this discipline, that principle prevail'd, viz. That imposition of hands was unnecessary in the ordination of Ministers; and therefore *Robert Bruce*, who was afterwards for several years a preacher at *Edinburgh*, being chosen one of the Ministers of that city in 1598, and being press'd to receive imposition of hands, refused it<sup>r</sup>, under pretence, as he said, that he held the approbation of the assembly sufficient in the room of Ordination. He afterwards comply'd, being forced to it by the importunity of several persons, but he declar'd that he did not look upon the imposition of hands as a new Ordination, but simply as a designation to a particular *Flock*; and

<sup>m</sup> Ib. p. 260.  
wood's *Hist* p. 291.  
*Church History*, p. 116.  
Calderwood, p. 413.

<sup>n</sup> *Calderwood*, p. 56.

<sup>p</sup> Ib. p. 303.

<sup>o</sup> *Spotf-*

<sup>q</sup> *Calderwood's*

<sup>r</sup> *Spotfwood's History*, p. 451.



## 22 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

it appears that the Ordainers were of the same sentiments.

A few years afterwards, *James* the first uniting the kingdoms of *England* and *Scotland* in his person, that Prince, zealous for *Episcopacy*, contriv'd to re-establish it in *Scotland*; but yet he wanted *Bishops* who had power to consecrate others, and therefore he sent for three Ministers to come to him into *England*, whom he got to be consecrated in 1610, by the Bishops of *London*, *Ely*, *Rochester*, and *Worcester*<sup>s</sup>; and these Bishops thus ordained, afterwards consecrated others according to the Ritual of *Edward VI.* There was a difficulty which arose about this Consecration, because the Bishop of *Ely* insisted to have these Ministers ordain'd Priests, before they were consecrated, they not having receiv'd the order of Priesthood from any Bishop. But *Bancroft* Archbishop of *Canterbury* maintain'd<sup>t</sup>, that the Ordination given by Priests ought to be esteemed valid, tho' it was not administred by Bishops; for otherwise the greatest part of the reform'd Churches would be found to want Ministers; and that the episcopal power did otherwise supply the other orders: for which he brought examples out of antiquity. All acquiesc'd in his opinion, and contented themselves in consecrating the new Bishops, without conferring the inferior orders upon them.

Things continued for a while in this state, until the time of the famous<sup>v</sup> rebellion which brought King *Charles the first* to the block: For at that time Episcopacy was again abolish'd, in the assemblies<sup>x</sup> of *Glasgow* and *Edenburgh*, in order to re-establish Presbytery upon the ruins of it; and, in a word, it continu'd suppress'd notwithstanding the opposition of the old Bishops, even untill the restoration of King *Charles the second*, who made it his business to restore Bishops to

<sup>s</sup> Spotswood, p. 514. Calderwood, p. 644. <sup>t</sup> Heylin's *Hist. of the Presbyterians*, p. 327. and Collier's *Church History*, tom 2. p. 702. <sup>v</sup> In 1639. <sup>x</sup> The Life of Archbishop Laud, p. 56.

their authority by Consecration. In order to this, in 1664, he caused four Presbyterian Ministers to come to London, who after they were made sensible of the invalidity of their former Ordination, were first ordained *Deacons* and *Priests*, and afterwards were consecrated *Bishops* by the Bishop of *Winchester*, assisted by two others<sup>y</sup>.

One would imagine this might be the last period of these changes: But the revolution in 1688, gave birth to a new turn in the government of that church<sup>z</sup>. The *Scottish* Bishops were remarkably attach'd to King *James the second*. Upon the new expedition of the Prince of *Orange* against his father-in-law, those Prelates writ to the King, assuring him of their fidelity: This letter proved fatal not only to the Bishops who writ it, but even to Episcopacy itself; for the Presbyterians, taking advantage of those affections which King *William* naturally bore towards them, and of the hatred which he had conceiv'd against the Bishops who were attach'd to King *James*, made a solemn demand in Parliament in 1689, for the abolition of Episcopacy<sup>a</sup>; which demand was agreed to in 1695. The Marquess of *Tweeddale* assured both Houses in the name of King *William*<sup>b</sup>, that his Majesty would have a particular regard to the peace of the church, and that his intention was to maintain the Presbyterian government as it was then establish'd. Here in short terminated all the combustions of that church where-with she had been agitated ever since the time of the reformation; and there is reason to believe that Episcopacy is too odious there to recover itself again, if *Calvinism* does not give way to the old religion.

The reason why I have given this historical account is, that the changes in the church of *England* might not be confounded with those in the church of *Scot-*

<sup>y</sup> Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, p. 887. tom. 2. *The Life of King Charles II.* p. 253. <sup>z</sup> *The Lives of King William and Queen Mary*, p. 520. <sup>a</sup> *Ib.* p. 538. <sup>b</sup> *Ib.* p. 705.

## 24      *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

*land*; for in the one Episcopacy was always the prevailing government, excepting a few years wherein it was abolish'd; nevertheless there were Bishops enough left to consecrate new ones, as soon as King *Charles the second* was restor'd: But it was otherwise in *Scotland*; at the beginning of the pretended reformation there, Episcopacy was abolish'd, and was restored but by intervals; and it was also so weakened by the usurpations of the Presbyterian Ministers, that the Bishops conserv'd only the shadow of their authority and dignity. The Ordination of the *Scotish* Bishops is not the point then that I am here to consider. The first, which they call'd Superintendants, in imitation of the *German* churches, were no true Bishops, as it will easily appear; and they were never thought so, until those whom King *James the first*, and King *Charles the second* brought into *England* in 1610 and 1664, to be consecrated, and they whom those Bishops afterwards consecrated. But these two efforts being of no consequence, and the validity of their Ordination depending intirely upon that of the *English*, it is unnecessary to enter into a debate about the validity or invalidity of the *Scotish* Ordinations; and what we have to say concerning those of the *English*, will be more than sufficient to determine us in what we are to think of the others.

As to what regards the changes of the church of *England*, with respect to the Ordination of her Bishops, they may properly be reduc'd to five. 1. That which was made under *Henry the eighth*. 2. That of *Edward the sixth*. 3. That of *Elizabeth*. 4. That under *Cromwell*. 5. And lastly, That under *Charles the second*. Under *Henry the eighth*, the oath which the Bishops were used to take to the *Pope*, was abolish'd out of the form of Ordination, but the rest of the ceremonial subsisted as it did before. Under *Edward the sixth*, there was nothing preserv'd of the matter of Ordination, except the imposition of hands; and as to the prayers and forms, they were almost all changed.



## of the English ORDINATIONS. 25

ed. Under *Elizabeth* the Ritual of King *Edward* was restor'd, but the difficulty is to know whether it was done by a sufficient authority. Under *Cromwell* Episcopacy was abolish'd in 1646, and along with it the forms of Ordination. In fine, under *Charles* the second Episcopacy was re-establish'd, and the old *Formulary* of *Edward* the sixth was restor'd, but review'd; and it is that which at this day is still in use, and is solemnly receiv'd and approv'd of in the church of *England*.

The change that happen'd in the time of *Cromwell* does not affect us at all; as there were no Ordinations performed during the time of his government, there is nothing to be discuss'd upon this article. The Bishops who surviv'd that *Usurper*, ordain'd others in the room of those that were dead; and there was no other misfortune attending this interruption, but the long vacancy of several Sees.

There is no great inconveniency that attends the change made in the time of *Henry* the eighth; all Catholics do agree that the omission of the Oath to the *Pope*, is not sufficient to render an Ordination invalid; and besides several of the Bishops ordain'd by *Cranmer*, without taking that Oath, were receiv'd for true Bishops, and were not re-ordain'd upon their reunion in the days of *Queen Mary*. This thing doth appear out of dispute.

It remains that we should consider if the Ordinations perform'd according to the new *Ritual* of *Edward* the sixth, *Elizabeth*, and *Charles* the second, ought to be receiv'd as valid. We make here but one question of these three different periods, because it will appear in the consequence, that we ought to give but one and the same decision unto them all, the changes made under *Charles* the second, being of two little importance to breed any difference in Judgment upon that head. It is true, that some people would have the addition pass for essential which was made in the time of *Charles* the second to the form, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*,

## 26 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

*Sanctum*, &c. but I do not see how it can be prov'd, and upon comparing it with the *Roman Pontifical*, one must be perswaded of the contrary.

But before the validity or invalidity of the *English Ordinations* is examin'd into, it is convenient to relate the history of that of *Parker*, in which there will more difficulties arise than in any other; for this Pre-late is the root and source of the new Ministry; if his Ordination be invalid, the validity of the rest fails of course, and on the contrary, the validity of his naturally establishes the truth of the *Hierarchy* in that church, tho' schism and error may have cast a blemish upon the succession.

This then is the particular *fact* which must be fastened upon in order to determine this question clearly. And as Monsieur L'Abbe *Renaudot*, in his *Memoire*, has used all his efforts to destroy the validity of this Ordination, it is necessary to lay before the reader this *fact*, and to set forth clearly and succinctly after what manner this transaction happen'd.

### CHAP. II.

*An History of the Ordination of Parker by Barlow. The authentickness of the Record wherein it is register'd, and the falshood of the Stories publish'd upon that occasion.*

CARDINAL *Pole* surviving Queen *Mary* but a few hours<sup>c</sup>, Queen *Elizabeth*, at her coming to the crown, found the Archbishoprick of *Canterbury* at her disposal; a post of great consequence with respect to the situation in which she found the church of *England*, as also with regard to the Queen's particular views; nor could she think of a Man more proper to fill that

<sup>c</sup> November, 1558.

See, than *Matthew Parker*. This *Doctor* had very reputably fill'd several stations in the reign of *Henry the eighth*, and *Edward the sixth*; but being despoil'd of all his dignities in the time of *Queen Mary*, he led a private life, and shut himself up amongst his books, in order to make his study his principal Entertainment.

As soon as *Queen Elizabeth* ascended the throne, he was recall'd to court, and employ'd in the reformation which that Princess propos'd to establish in her realm; for she thought *Parker* a fit person to further her designs: She had moreover her eyes upon him to raise him to the See of *Canterbury*, so that after finishing the first measures which she was oblig'd to take at the beginning of her reign, she hasten'd a *Conge d'eslire*<sup>d</sup> to the chapter of *Canterbury*, on the 18<sup>th</sup> of *July 1559*.

The chapter found it self divided about the business of the Reformation, and those who were attach'd to the catholick party absented themselves; the others, who were fewest in number, did, on the first of *August*, chuse by way of compromise, *Matthew Parker* for their Archbishop, and certified this election to the Queen; which in fine she confirm'd by her letters patents.

Having done this<sup>e</sup>, on the 9<sup>th</sup> of *September* she directed a commission to *Cuthbert Bishop of Durham*, *Gilbert Bishop of Bath*, *David Bishop of Peterborough*, *Anthony Bishop of Landaff*, *William Barlow Bishop*, and *John Scory*<sup>f</sup> Bishop also, for the Consecration and Confirmation of *Parker*. This commission was never executed, for what reason we do not know. § There is indeed some reason to believe that some of these Bishops, continuing Catholics, refus'd to take their part in this Ordination, and that the space of time which pass'd between the date of the first and second commission, was employ'd in finding out other Bishops to substitute in the room of the former.

<sup>d</sup> *The Life of Matthew Parker*, p. 52.

<sup>e</sup> *Ibid.* p. 58.

<sup>f</sup> *Rymer*, tom. 15. p. 541,

§ See the Proofs in the Appendix.



## 28 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

Nevertheless the Queen, on the 6<sup>th</sup> of December <sup>h</sup>, caus'd another commission to be directed to *Anthony Bishop of Landaff*, *William Barlow* formerly Bishop of *Bath*, and Bishop elect of *Chichester*, *John Scory* formerly Bishop of *Chichester*, and Bishop elect of *Hereford*, *Miles Coverdale* formerly Bishop of *Exeter*, *Richard* (instead of *John*) de *Bedford*, and *John de Thetford*, Suffragan Bishops, and *John Bale* Bishop of *Ossory*, to the end that all, or at least four of them, should proceed to the consecration of *Parker*. These letters patents contain one clause in them which the former had not, and which afterwards afforded matter for attacking this Ordination; it is because the Queen says, that she supplies by her own authority all that was done upon this occasion contrary to the usages of the realm, and to the ecclesiastical laws. *Suppletur nichilominus, suprema auctoritate nostra regia, ex mero motu ac certa scientia nostris, si quid aut in hiis quæ juxta mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fient, aut in vobis, aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate vestris, ad præmissa perficienda, desit, aut deerit eorum, quæ per statuta hujus Regni, aut per leges ecclesiasticas, in hac parte requiruntur, aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione, & rerum necessitate id postulante.*

But tho' *Anthony Bishop of Landaff* took the Oath of supremacy, yet it does appear that he would not act his part in this Consecration, either upon the account of his infirmities, or else his attachment to the church, or for some other reason which I cannot guess at; so that *Barlow*, finding himself at the head of the commission, assisted by *John Scory Bishop elect of Hereford*, *Miles Coverdale* the old Bishop of *Exeter*, and by *John Hodgkins* Suffragan of *Bedford*, confirm'd *Parker's* election on the 9<sup>th</sup> of December <sup>i</sup>. The act of confirmation is to be found in *Archbishop Bramhall's Works*; and the author of the *Life of Mathew Parker* has also inserted several large fragments of it in his history.

<sup>h</sup> Rymer, tom. 15. p. 550. <sup>i</sup> *The Life of Matthew Parker*, p. 56.

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 29

The Consecration was delay'd for some days, but in fine it was perform'd on Sunday the 17<sup>th</sup> of December, 1559, at *Lambeth*, by the same Bishops who confirm'd the election. <sup>k</sup> The Record is to be found in *Bramhall's Works*, and in *Burnet's History* among the Records. I have also inserted it at the end of this book, as a piece too essential to be omitted. By this Record one may plainly see, that the Ordinal of *Edward* the sixth was exactly observed; for first they began with the morning prayers, after which the Bishop of *Hereford* preach'd a sermon before the ceremony began; then *Parker* was presented to *Barlow*, and when he had taken the Oaths to the Queen, and the prayers prescrib'd in the new Ordinal had been made use of, they laid their hands on him, saying in *English*, Take the Holy Ghost, and remembre that thou stirre up the Grace of God whiche is in thee by imposition of Handes, &c. They afterwards deliver'd the Bible into his hands, and having communicated together, the ceremony ended. Those who have written of these things, tell us that the original acts are still preserv'd in the Registers of *Canterbury*, and in *Corpus Christi* College Library at *Cambridge*, and one may perceive that the whole account agrees with the publick Records which are in *Rymer's* collection, as well as with those in the Registers of *Canterbury*, against which nothing ought to be objected without good reasons.

Without doubt it is from these Registers that *Camden*, a contemporary author, and one of the most exact and judicious Writers which *England* has produced, drew the account which he has given of this Ordination, intirely conformable to that which we have now publish'd. "<sup>l</sup> *Matthew Parker*, says he, a Man  
" pious, learned, and of discreet behaviour, who be-  
" ing

<sup>k</sup> Bramhall, p. 1051. and Burnet, tom. 1. in the Appendix, p. 363. See also our Appendix.

<sup>l</sup> Matthæus Parkerus, vir pius, eruditus, & moribus modestissimis, qui Hen. 8. à sacris, Collegiatae Ecclesiae Stoke-Clarae decanus praefuerat, ad Archiepiscopatum Cantuariensem ritè electus,

“ing chaplain in ordinary to *Henry the eighth*, was by  
 “him made Dean of the collegiate church of *Stoke-*  
 “*Clare*, was duly elected Archbishop of *Canterbury*,  
 “and consecrated at *Lambeth*, after the preaching of a  
 “Sermon, the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the  
 “celebration of the Eucharist, by the imposition of  
 “the hands of three Bishops, namely, of *William*  
 “*Barlow* formerly Bishop of *Bath*, *John Scory* formerly  
 “Bishop of *Chichester*, *Miles Coverdale* formerly Bishop  
 “of *Exeter*, and *John Suffragan Bishop of Bedford*.  
 “He afterwards consecrated *Edmund Grindall*,” &c.  
 All this perfectly agrees with the *Journal* of the life of  
*Parker*, which was found after his death among his  
 papers, and which Mr. *Stripe* has printed among the  
 Records annex’d to his History, in which there are  
 these remarkable words, <sup>m</sup> December 17. *I was consecra-*  
*ted Archbishop of Canterbury. Alas! alas! O Lord God,*  
*for what times has thou preserv’d me! &c.* Nor do we  
 find that such positive testimonies can be confronted  
 by any solid proofs, or by any record that contradicts  
 them.

Nevertheless how reasonable soever it may seem to  
 give greater credit to such publick and solemn acts as  
 these, than to silly empty stories, yet several catholick  
 writers have not stuck to give a very opposite account  
 to what is here related. “<sup>n</sup> In the beginning of Queen  
 “*Elizabeth’s* reign, says *Champney* upon the testimony  
 “of several writers, the catholick Bishops being de-  
 “pos’d and imprison’d, as shall be seen hereafter,  
 “others

electus, concione habita, Spiritu Sancto invocato, & Eucharistia  
 celebrata, impositione manuum trium quondam Episcoporum,  
 Gul. Barlovi Bathoniensis, Joh. Scorii Cicestriensis, Milonis Co-  
 verdali Exoniensis, & Johannis Suffraganei Bedfordiensis, Lam-  
 bethæ consecratur. Ille postea consecravit Edmundum Grindal-  
 lum, &c. Camden. Anal. Eliz. p. 38. & edit.earn. p. 49.

<sup>m</sup> 17 Decembris Ann. 1559, consecratus sum in Archiepisco-  
 pum Cantuariensem. Heu! heu! Domine Deus, in quæ tem-  
 pora servasti me! &c. *The Life of Matthew Parker, Append. p. 15.*

<sup>n</sup> Initio regni Elizabethæ, depositis & in custodiam concessis  
 catholicis Episcopis, ut infra videbimus, alii creandi, & illis suf-  
 ficiendi



## of the English ORDINATIONS: 31

“ others were to be ordain'd and substituted in their  
 “ places. They who were nominated and elected to  
 “ this dignity, met at *London* by appointment, at the  
 “ sign of the *Nagshhead* in *Cheapside*; thither likewise,  
 “ upon invitation, came the Bishop of *Landaff*, grown  
 “ decrepid by reason of his age, and a simple time-  
 “ rous Man, from whom the new candidates expected  
 “ Ordination: But *Boner* Bishop of *London*, then in  
 “ Prison upon the account of religion, hearing of it,  
 “ threaten'd *Landaff* with excommunication if he or-  
 “ dained them; who, being terrified by this message,  
 “ and perhaps being inwardly touch'd with the stings  
 “ of conscience, drew back and refus'd to lay his  
 “ hands upon them, alledging the weakness of his  
 “ eyes as the cause. The new candidates being thus  
 “ deceived in their expectations, and thinking them-  
 “ selves imposed upon, began to revile the old Man,  
 “ whom they had before treated with a great deal of  
 “ reverence and respect; some of them saying, *This Fool*  
 “ *believes we cannot be made Bishops unless we are greaz'd*  
 “ *with Oyl*, ridiculing as well the old Bishop as this  
 “ catholick custom in Consecration. But being thus  
 “ depriv'd of a Consecrator, they were forc'd to seek  
 “ for a new expedient; and they had recourse to  
 “ *Scory*,

ficiendi erant. Qui fuerunt ad illam dignitatem nominati &  
 electi, ex conducto in quodam hospitio (cui insigne erat Caput  
 Mannuli in vico dicto Cheapside) Londini convenerunt. Illuc  
 etiam invitatus venit Landavensis Episcopus, multa senectute  
 jam decrepitu, vir simplex & meticulosus. Ab ipso expecta-  
 bant ordinationem novi Candidati: Quod Bonerus Episcopus  
 Londinensis, in carcere religionis ergo constitutus, subolfaciens,  
 minatus est Landavensi excommunicationem, si eos ordinaret;  
 quo nuncio territus, & tactus etiam fortassis intrinsecus consci-  
 entiae stimulis, ille pedem retulit, & oculorum infirmitatem  
 causatus, manus eis imponere recusavit. Expectantes ergo isti  
 spe sua frustrati, se illusos interpretantes, senem, quem antea  
 honore & reverentiâ non mediocri prosequiebantur, opprobriis  
 lacessere cœperunt; quidam inter illos dicentes, *Delirus iste senex*  
*existimat nos Episcopos non fore, nisi leniti & oleo delibuti fueri-*  
*mus!* tam Episcopum senem quam catholicum consecrationis  
 ritum ludibrio habentes. Consecratore tamen frustrati, novum  
 coguntur

## 32 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

“ *Scory*, an apostate *Monk*, for their Ordination, who  
 “ under *Edward the sixth* had usurp’d a Bishoprick with-  
 “ out any Consecration, as shall be made to appear here-  
 “ after : This Man who had, together with his reli-  
 “ gious habit, put off all conscience, soon perform’d  
 “ what they desired, using this ceremony : They all  
 “ kneeling before him, and he laying the bible upon  
 “ the head of each of them, said, *Receive power to*  
 “ *preach the word of God sincerely*; and thus they all rose  
 “ up Bishops.”

*Champney* adds, that he had this account from one nam’d *Thomas Bluet*, who receiv’d it himself from *Thomas Neal*, then an Officer of Bishop *Boner’s*, who was sent by *Boner* to the Bishop of *Landaff*, to forbid him to act in that affair under pain of excommunication, and to be a witness of what pass’d there ; which was thus as it is here related.

Nothing seems more particular than this testimony, but when one goes by hearsay, it is rare to meet with truth. Nothing in short is more full of contradiction than this account ; and the falshood of it appears visible to the eyes of the world. To put this in a light past all dispute ; if we suspend for a moment our belief of the reality of *Parker’s* Ordination, yet we cannot charge with falshood and supposition, all those Records which *Rymer* has given us. Now the truth of these Acts cannot subsist with the account of *Neal* as it is related by *Champney*.

1. For according to *Neal*, all the new Bishops were ordained together by *Scory* ; and by *Rymer’s* Records, which in this agrees with *Parker’s* Register, one finds

coguntur quærere consilium, & ad Scoreum apostatam Monachum (qui sub Edwardo sexto absque ulla consecratione, ut statim videbimus, Episcopatum invaserat) ut ab eo ordinarentur, recurrunt. Iste qui cum habitu religioso conscientiam omnem exuerat, rem citò peregit, hac usus ceremonia ; Illis omnibus ante ipsum genua flectentibus, unicuique illorum biblia super caput imponens, dixit, *Accipite potestatem verbum Dei sincere prædicandi* ; & sic surrexerunt omnes Episcopi. *Champney de vocatione Ministr. c. 14. p. 497.*

of the English ORDINATIONS. 33

the commissions for the Ordination of these Bishops, of different dates, and the Register represents these Ordinations as perform'd upon different days; thus ° after the Consecration of *Parker*, which was on the 17th of *December*, *Parker* himself consecrated four others on the 21st. Five more were consecrated on the 21st of *January* 15<sup>52</sup>; two on the second of *March*, and two more on the 24th of *March*. If therefore the account which *Neal* has given be true, not only the Register of *Parker's* Consecration must be false, but also all these other Records, and as an after-clap all the Queen's Commissions and Letters Patents, which are produc'd as the most authentick Records drawn out of publick repositories, must be likewise false.

2. One may find in the same collection<sup>p</sup>, the Record of the investiture of the Archbishop of *Canterbury* in his temporalities, dated the 22<sup>d</sup> day of *March*, which agrees with the act of Ordination which I have publish'd; it must also be presum'd that this new Record is also forg'd, and that it is not to be found in the *Archives* of the realm, which is ridiculous.

3. What colour is there that those Bishops who were willing to put the best appearance upon their schism, should chuse a tavern for this ceremony, and that they should in other respects be so imprudent, as to make it so little a secret to suffer it to come to the knowledge of the Bishop of *London*? That they should admit a person so little known as *Neal*, whom they had reason to suspect that he came as a spy upon their proceedings, which they had so much interest to conceal. Men so dispos'd as these Bishops are presum'd to be, would never have troubled their heads about these ceremonies, since Consecration must appear to them very indifferent; for assuredly they might as well have had none at all, as that which it is suppos'd they receiv'd.

4. According to *Sanders*, notwithstanding the repeal of the old laws, Queen *Elizabeth* always took care

° *Parker's Life*, p. 63.

p Rymer, tom. 15 p. 573.



that those whom she nominated for Bishops were ordain'd with the ceremonies prescrib'd by the laws of the realm. <sup>¶</sup> Elizabeth indeed confer'd Bishopricks by letters patents, says this author, whose testimony cannot be suspected, yet so as she oblig'd those who were thus collated to be ordain'd by certain persons, and by some ceremonies prescrib'd by the laws of the realm. Now if in the first Ordination made at the beginning of the reign of that Princess, they violated the laws with so little precaution, as the history of the *Naghead* does imply, there is no room to doubt but this author, so very diligent to forget nothing that might tend to blacken the new ecclesiastical government introduc'd into *England*, would expose an Ordination so irregular, and not have waved a proof so very signal, so very convincing of the invalidity of their ministry.

5. The threatening which is said to be made by *Boner* is ridiculous: The Bishop of *Landaff*, tho' so attach'd to the catholick doctrine, that he was slow enough in siding with schismatics against his conscience, yet would he value much an excommunication which he sufficiently incurr'd before, in taking the Oath of supremacy? And *Boner* must know that the Bishop of *Landaff* had embarrass'd himself too much already.

6. The relation of *Neal* imports that *Scory* intruded himself into the episcopal function without ever having receiv'd Consecration. *Sub Edwardo sexto absque ulla consecratione episcopatum invaserit.* Now this fact is entirely false, for he was consecrated by *Cranmer*, according to the new Ordinal of King *Edward*; and this is a fact publicly acknowledg'd by all historians. The Register of *Cranmer* proves it, and the author of the *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, points out the day of his Consecration; and one must be astonish'd to find the au-

<sup>¶</sup> Elizabetha quidem ita hæc [officia] per litteras patentes conferebat, ut tamen oportuerit eos, quibus collata erant, à certis personis ac ritu etiam certo secundum leges Regni ordinari. *Sanderus de Schism. Ang. lib. 3. p. 347.*

thor so ignorant, that his whole account is one continued heap of falsehoods.

7. If this History had but the shadow of truth, how comes it to pass that *Parker* was not reproach'd with it in his own life-time? And why did they not attempt to prove that his Ordination was perform'd contrary to the laws and rules then establish'd, and by persons that were not regarded as Bishops? In short, this fable which had its birth in the reign of King *James* the first, is not to be met with in any of the authors who have written in *Parker's* own times. *Sanders* himself, as I have already observed, makes no mention of it, and yet he would not have forgot it, if he had had any room to prattle. There is small reason to believe that the dinner which was made on the ninth of *December*, at the ceremony of *Parker's* Confirmation, which was eight days before his Consecration, is the ground from whence this story proceeded, which was afterwards embellish'd with further fictions. But to shew this more evidently to be a fable, it will be convenient to examine into what is said against the authentickness of the Record which I have produc'd.

They object principally three things to render this Record suspected of forgery. 1. They say it was fifty years before it was produc'd. 2. That the persons who publish'd it, having an interest in the presumption of its being genuine, it therefore ought to be suspected. 3. That the authors who cite it, make different reports of the names of the Consecrators; which disagreement evidently denotes its falsity. This is all that is urg'd, most plausibly, to render the Record suspected; tho' the reading of the Record it self, and the authentick certificates which attest the truth and antiquity of it, forms a strong presumption in its favour: But not to dwell upon bare presumptions, let us examine particularly the difficulties brought against us.

This Record, they say, was not produc'd until more than fifty years after the fact happen'd; and what

should hinder its appearance for so long a time, if it had been genuine? I doubt very much whether this objection be serious; because, in short, was it ever the custom to publish all the proceedings in ceremonies which are perform'd of this kind? If the fable of the Ordination at the *Nagshhead* had been more ancient than it is, we should have had the Record sooner publish'd to destroy it; but when the method of this proceeding was known, what necessity was there to publish an account of it? How many Records are there shut up which are no less authentick for that reason? And besides, was it ever refus'd to be produc'd, or shewn to them who wanted information in this matter? It is a strange thing if all the Records that are kept private should be suspected because they were never expos'd? What becomes of all our History, if, to remove all suspicions, it should be objected that the Records had hitherto been kept secret?

Moreover this Record was cited in *Parker's* own time, which citation is a proof of its existence then; for in the *lives* of the Archbishops of *Canterbury*, publish'd at *London* in 1572, before the death of *Parker*, it is written of him, <sup>r</sup> "That in the year 1559, he was  
" chosen Archbishop of *Canterbury*, by the Dean and  
" Chapter of the metropolitan church of *Canterbury*,  
" and was afterwards in the same year, on the 17<sup>th</sup>  
" of *December*, consecrated according to law by four  
" Bishops, *William* Bishop of *Chichester*, *John* of *Here-*  
" *ford*, *Miles* late Bishop of *Exeter*, and *Richard* (read  
" *John*) of *Bedford*. There is this note in the margin, *Hæ consecrationes & confirmationes in registris apparent.* " These consecrations and confirmations appear

<sup>r</sup> Anno itaque, Dom. 1559, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus electus est à Decano & Capitulo Ecclesiæ Metropoliticæ Cantuariensis, posteaque eodem anno 17. die Decembris, adhibitis quatuor Episcopis Willielmo Cicestrensi, Johanne Herefordiensi, Milone quondam Exoniensi, & Ricardo (leg. Johanne) Bedfordiensi, lege quadam de hac re lata requisitis, consecratus est. See the *Life of Matthew Parker* in *Mr. Strype's Appendix*, p. 151.



“ in the Registers.” *Camden, Godwin, Hall*, and other writers, have taken notice of this Record, and have cited it, and no body then durst charge the Registers with falshood. But the relation of *Godwin* is still much stronger, and puts this matter quite out of dispute.

*George Abbot* Archbishop of *Canterbury*<sup>s</sup>, being willing to convince *Fitzherbert*, how little foundation there was for those suspicions rais’d against the Registers, and to confute him by shewing them to Catholicks, as had been desired; he caus’d four Catholicks to come to him, three whereof were Jesuits, and in the presence of the Bishops of *London, Durham, Ely, Bath, Lincoln, and Rochester*, suffer’d them to examine the Register as much as they pleas’d; they examined it, and promised to give an account of it to *Fitzherbert*. It is true, that being again remanded to prison, and having requir’d that the book should be put into their hands to examine it with greater attention, they were refus’d, and were told that those books were not to be remov’d, that they might examine them again upon the place, but that they would not trust them in their hands; and these insisted upon this refusal to colour their charge of forgery. But truly was this a reasonable request? And ought they not to have expected such an answer? If this were sufficient to create a suspicion that the Registers were forged, what Record can be free from suspicion? There being nothing so unheard of, as to trust monuments so essential, whose conservation is of such consequence, in the hands of strangers and enemies.

In circumstances where nothing of this nature was to be apprehended, the inspection and examination of these Registers was always permitted without the least difficulty. I can affirm this from my own experience in the resolution that I had taken to confirm my self more strongly of the authentickness of these *acts*: For tho’ I had not the honour to be known to the Archbi-

<sup>s</sup> Godwin de Præf. Ang. p. 219.

shop of *Canterbury*, yet upon my bare application, he was pleased to permit a new *Examen* to be made in the presence of four witnesses, two whereof are Catholics, and the other two of the church of *England*. It will appear by the certificate which I have inserted among my *Records*, the original whereof is now in the 'King's library, annex'd to the works of *Bramhall*, which are there, that the *act* printed in *Bramhall's* book is intirely conformable to the Registers. And this Prelate sent me a certificate in his letter of the 21<sup>st</sup> of *February*, old style, 172<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>, that the hand-writing is of the same time, and by the same hand with the rest of the following *Acts* in this Register; so that if these first are false, we must presume the same of all the others; and the same must be supposed of those that regard affairs purely civil; which is an assertion not to be supported. *I answer*, says Archbishop *Wake*, that you may depend upon it, that the whole entry of the *acts* of *Matthew Parker's* Consecration, with all the instruments relating to it in my Registers, are written in the same hand with the other *Acts* of what passed during his Archiepiscopate, and all at the time that they were done.

This first objection is therefore very unreasonable; tho' it is not this that they most insist upon, but on another, namely, that this Record and Registers are produc'd by none but such as are interested to falsify them, and that the sole guardians of these monuments may with impunity forge or corrupt them. Suspensions, it is true, are ordinarily and mutually rais'd by all parties, and it is a scandal to mankind, that they have, by their frequent frauds, given cause to think that probity and honour doth not subsist among Men of different interests, and differing sentiments: Nevertheless justice requires that we should not raise such suspicions as these, unless there be some proofs of forgery and corruption; and there are several reasons that evince there is nothing of this kind in this case.

The first, which we have already touch'd upon before, is that no body can accuse the act of *Parker's* Consecration, or the Registers wherein it is recorded, of forgery or corruption, without bringing a suspicion upon the publick Records collected by *Rymer*; for we see that the Records in that collection, as well with regard to the subject, as the date of them, perfectly agree with this Act and with the Registers. Now where there is an harmony so perfect, what appearance is there of forgery? And how can an *endless uncertainty* be avoided in history, if without any proof, without any foundation, the slightest suspicions, and the most unreasonable prejudices shall suffice to discredit Records which the publick faith has render'd sacred?

A second reason which appears convincing, is that if they had had a mind to forge Records, they would not have confin'd themselves to these, and they would have dress'd them up otherwise than they are. First they would have given us the Record of *Barlow's* Consecration, which is so essential in this affair; they would have omitted the clause in the mandate of *Parker's* Consecration, from which an advantage is taken against him. In a word, they would have omitted nothing essential, nor inserted any thing that was to their prejudice. Besides, if they were to forge a relation, they would have dress'd up the Consecration according to the rites of the *Roman* Pontifical, rather than *King Edward's* Ordinal; this would have cost them no more pains, and they would thereby have prejudiced the *Roman* Catholicks in the favour of their Ordination, which it was their interest to do; this nevertheless was not done: The forgery is therefore a mere *chimæra*, and has no other ground but a sort of a distrust, and an unreasonable prejudice.

The variations which we find among the several authors who have cited these Registers, make up the third objection against them, which in my opinion is the most apparent and the most reasonable. And this



disagreement is very obvious: For one says that *Parker* was consecrated by *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *John* Suffragan of *Dover*. *Sutcliff* joins to the three first two Suffragans. The author of the *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, has but one Suffragan with the three Bishops, who is *Richard* Suffragan of *Bedford*. *Mason* agrees with this latter as to the number, only he calls the Suffragan *John*. In short, the Record of the 6th of *December*, found in *Rymer*, names seven to whom the mandate for Consecration is address'd; that is to say, the Bishop of *Landaff*, *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, *Richard* Suffragan of *Bedford*, *John* Suffragan of *Therford*, and the Bishop of *Ossory* in *Ireland*. So that we see five differing accounts of the same fact: And what are we to believe amidst so much variety? And what greater proof of the forgery of a Record, than the contrariety which is found among those that cite it?

This difficulty appears astonishing at first sight; but when the disagreement, which at first seems considerable, is examin'd to the bottom, by degrees, the objection at the same time vanishes away, as you will soon perceive.

The Queen's Letters Patents for the Consecration of *Parker* must not, in the first place, be received in a sense that bears a variety: She addresses her letters to seven, but the same letters imply, that four of that number is sufficient to execute that Commission. *Quatenus vos, aut ad minus quatuor vestrum---eundem Matthæum Parkerum in Archiepiscopum prædictæ---consecrare velitis cum effectu*. Now this is what agrees with *Mason*, the author of the *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, and with *Butler*, and with *Bramhall*, *Burnet*, *Collier*, and all other succeeding writers.

If *Sutcliff* mentions two Suffragans, it is because he was deceived by the Queen's Letters Patents, in which there are two actually nam'd, and did not observe that the *Act* inserted in the Registers mentions but one; and as to *Butler* who mentions another Suffragan,

of the English ORDINATIONS. 41

Suffragan, if it be not the fault of the Transcriber or the Printer, it must proceed from his not consulting the Registers, and that he did cite them no otherwise than upon hearsay, or a bad memory.

But what is here worth observing is, that those who have publish'd this Record, always agree together. *Bramhall* and *Burnet* publish'd it intire; *Mason* and *Collier* have either quoted large fragments out of it, or else the substance of it, and we find no disagreement in what they have publish'd. The variations therefore in question not proceeding from the *act* it self, they ought not to be produced as a proof of its being a forgery.

Before this Record was made publick, there is reason to believe that it was cited only upon unfaithful reports, or bad memories. Now would it not be surprising if such citations were always exact? And should a Man so rashly condemn a Record of inconsistency, whose substance is so uniform? For we see all agree that the Ordination was perform'd by *Barlow*, *Scory*, and *Coverdale*, and all (except one who puts in two) mention one Suffragan; and if they do not agree in the name, yet one may see the reason very clearly in the *Queen's Letters*, wherein he will find the name wrong. These differences do not prove that there are different *Acts* of this Consecration, but that the *Act* in the Register was not exactly transcribed by those who have quoted it; and this is what we see daily instances of, among those who cite Manuscripts, whose citations are found defective by those who more attentively examine after them, because the former, either by reason of precipitation, forgetfulness, or inadvertency, did not always read or cite exactly.

In short, the *Act* even now exists in the Registers without any change; it is more than an hundred years that it has been seen such as it subsists to this day; those who have cited it wrong did it by hearsay. There is no difference but about the *fact*, which *fact* is

is only one name plac'd for another. Even the variety in these citations, proves that there was neither collusion nor forgery, but that they did not think fit to conceal any thing in favour of their own party. The blunders committed by writers less exact, have brought an *odium* upon these important *facts*. All these circumstances together shew, that the differences objected are insufficient to prove the Record in question a forgery; and that in spite of these disagreements, it supports its authority; nay more, there are authentic certificates given by publick Officers to attest, that the Record is the same with that which is publish'd.

But let us suppose that several writers contemporary with *Parker*, highly reproach'd him, as well as the other new Bishops that they had no Consecration; the Record of Consecration is therefore false; and if the story of the *Nagshead* be not true, yet it is nevertheless true, that he had no real Ordination.

This consequence appears to be very certain, in their sense who made these reproaches, without supposing the act forg'd. These Bishops, according to them, were not consecrated; because they were not so by that Form which they reputed essential, they did not regard them as consecrated Bishops: They might therefore think the Act or Record of Consecration genuine, and yet believe that these Bishops were not consecrated; because that the Record in question makes no mention but of a Consecration which they reputed intirely invalid. This is what evidently appears from *Stapleton's* way of reasoning against *Horn* Bishop of *Winchester*,<sup>\*</sup> *Who knows not, says he, that you and your Collegues were not ordain'd; I will not say otherwise than the Canons require, but contrary to the direction of your own statutes.* This therefore was not an intire omission of Consecration, but the want of a canonical Consecration, that he objected and defy'd him to prove. *Nec approbatam & assuetam vocationem*

<sup>\*</sup> *Stapletoni opera*, tom. 1. p. 839.



of the English ORDINATIONS. 43

*aut consecrationem ostendere unquam poteris.* It is in this sense that they upbraided the new Bishops with not being Bishops, and not having any Ordination; but is there the least room to conclude from such a way of reasoning, that the *act* of *Parker's* Consecration is forg'd; whereas, if it be look'd upon as genuine, the Argument has the same force?

For want of positive proofs they have had recourse to negative ones, to destroy the truth of these *acts* that are conserv'd in the Registers; and, in order to support the Fable of the *Nagshead* Tavern, that totters from side to side, *Champney* would fain apply the silence of *Stow*, that celebrated *English* Chronographer, against the Ordination of *Parker*: Which he does not mention, <sup>u</sup> says he, because if he had given an account in what manner things were perform'd at the *Nagshead*, he could not fail of drawing upon himself the ill-will of those whose interest it was to bury that scandalous Affair in oblivion. It is true, that to draw an advantage from a silence so *equivocal*, he is forc'd to confide in the private intelligence of his Friends, which he durst not publish in writing; but unlucky it is for *Champney* that his Friends are dumb witnesses, who are no proof, and in a matter of testimony and contestation are of no authority.

In short, to destroy the advantage which he would seem to draw from this pretended silence, and to convince these dumb witnesses, produc'd by *Champney*, of falshood, it is sufficient to remark: That if the History of the Ordination perform'd at the *Nagshead* be true, not only *Parker*, but all the new Bishops, nominated together with him by Queen *Elizabeth*, had no other Ordination. Nevertheless, according to *Stow*, <sup>x</sup> in his Description of the Antiquities of the City of *London*, *Grindal*, who was one of the new Bishops, nominated at the same time together with *Parker*, was not conse-

<sup>u</sup> De Vocat. Minist. cap. 14. p. 502.  
London, p. 491.

<sup>x</sup> *The Survey of*

#### 44 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

crated until the 21st of *December* 1559. Now this fact alone, reported by *Stow*, destroys the History of the *Nagshead*, and the Argument brought from his silence in his *Chronicle*, and the pretended secret Intelligence of his dumb Friends, who say nothing at all: For, according to the *Nagshead* Fable, the Ordination of *Parker*, of *Grindal*, and the rest, ought to have been perform'd by *Scory* in the month of *September* 1559. Now, according to *Stow*, *Grindal* was not ordain'd until the 21st of *December* in the same year, by *Parker*; therefore he was ignorant of the *Nagshead* Fable, and put no confidence in any secret Friends; and seeing his testimony agrees with *Parker's* Register, and *Rymer's* Records, he therefore bears witness to the authentickness of these acts, and consequently decides in favour of the account of *Parker's* Consecration, and against the Fable of the *Nagshead*.

After this any person may judge as he pleases of the silence which *Stow* has observ'd in his *Chronicle*; it is certain that it does not proceed from the motive alledg'd. Perhaps he thought it sufficient to mention *Parker's* Election, without saying any thing of his Consecration, or perhaps he thought it unnecessary to enter into a detail of a Ceremony, which would be only to repeat over again what was done in the time of King *Edward*. In fine, he might perchance not have seen the act of *Parker's* Consecration, which was not as yet publish'd, and without it he could not exactly describe this Ceremony: But, let what will be the cause of his silence, for guesses are infinite, it is evident by what he says in his History of *London*, that one can conclude nothing from him contrary to the account given in the Register, or in favour of this Tavern Story, since his testimony destroys it.

In short, the last resource in favour of the Fable, in opposition to the account given in the Register is, that the three first Bishops nominated in the Commission, dated the 9th of *September* 1559, for the Consecration

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 45

Consecration of *Parker*, viz. *Tonstal* Bishop of *Durham*, *Bourne* Bishop of *Bath*, and *Pool* Bishop of *Peterborough*, were depos'd in the month of *July* of the same year, according to *Stow's Chronicle*, for refusing the Oath of *Supremacy*; now, say they, there is no reason to think that the Queen would employ Bishops to consecrate *Parker*, whom she had depriv'd two months before; this Commission<sup>\*</sup> is therefore forg'd, and if this first be so, it is highly probable that the other, dated the 6th of *December*, is so too, and consequently so is the account of the Ordination perform'd in pursuance of it, and therefore he had no other Ordination, but that of the *Nagshead* in *London*, in the month of *September* 1559.

If this be the last refuge in favour of this Fable, I believe, that they shew sufficiently, that they have nothing to say, when they have recourse to such defences. I do agree that it is highly improbable, that the Queen would nominate those Bishops to consecrate *Parker*, whom she had caus'd to be depos'd two months before. But what one has to conclude from hence, is not that this Commission-way forg'd; but that then, namely, on the 9th of *September* 1559, those three Bishops were not as yet depos'd, as it may easily be prov'd by facts not at all doubtful.

1. For as to the Bishop of *Durham*, one may learn from a Manuscript in the *Cotton Library*, cited by Mr. *Strype*, y in his *Annals of the Reformation*, that he was not dispossest'd of his Bishoprick until the 29th of *September* 1559; and this Manuscript is supported by another evidence, which is yet less suspicious, viz. The Registers of the Chapter of *Durham*, wherein there is found, even to the 17th of *September*, that is to say eight entire days after the date of the Commission on the 9th, acts of *Jurisdiction* exercis'd by *Tonstal*, and confirm'd by the Chapter; he was therefore even until then in peaceable possession of that Church, and

y *Strype's Annals*, Tom. 3. p. 144.



## 46 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

his deposition must be posterior to these acts, and by consequence to the Commission dated on the 9th, and this agrees with the Manuscript, which does not mention it until the 29th.

2. This thing is yet more evident with regard to *Bourne* Bishop of *Bath*; for all the World agree, that this Bishop, as well as the rest, was depos'd for refusing the Oath of *Supremacy*. Now the Oath of *Supremacy* was not tender'd unto him until the end of *October* 1559. *Rymer*<sup>z</sup> furnishes us with a proof; for we find in his collection, a Commission dated the 18th of *October*, to tender him the Oath of *Supremacy*; he therefore had not refus'd it until then, and consequently his deposition, which that refusal supposes, is long after the Commission dated *September* the 9th, and by a much stronger reason was not in the month of *July* 1559.

3. As to *Pool* Bishop of *Peterborough*, he was not dispossest'd until about the same time that the Bishop of *Bath* was, that is to say, about the latter end of *October*, or the beginning of *November*; for by the register of the Church of *Peterborough*, we find acts of *Jurisdiction* exercis'd by him even until the end of *September*; and besides, the Chapter of *Canterbury*, who exercis'd the Metropolitan Jurisdiction in the vacant Churches depending upon that See during the vacancy, did not take upon them the government of the Church of *Peterborough* until the 11th of *November* 1559.<sup>a</sup> Therefore *Pool*'s deposition could not be long before that time; however, it is certain, that this is long after the 9th of *September*, which is the time of the date of the first Commission. This Commission therefore is not forg'd, so that we must conclude this story to be notoriously false, and contrary to what all these different Records report with so much exactness, and which sustain one another; so that it is not

<sup>z</sup> *Rymer*, Tom. 15. p. 546.

<sup>a</sup> *Ant. Harmer*. p. 151.  
possible

possible to contest their truth without entirely destroying the certainty of History.

But nevertheless, say they, *Stow* sets down the deposition of the Bishops in the month of *July* 1559. It is very true; but his testimony is fram'd in such a manner, that one can make no use of it: For *First*, *Stow* does not say, that these three particular Bishops, here spoken of, were depos'd at that time. *Secondly*, What he says may easily be reconcil'd with the facts which we have reported.

In short, the Queen's first Commission for tendering the Oath of *Supremacy* to the Bishops and others, having been expedited in the month of *May* 1559, the Oath was accordingly tender'd to several in that same month, and in the months of *June* and *July* following, and upon their refusal, several were depos'd at that time; so that if *Stow* would speak but of some Bishops, it is very certain, that they were depos'd in the month of *July*, as *Heath*<sup>b</sup> Archbishop of *York*, *Thirlby* Bishop of *Ely*, &c. But it is very false that all were depos'd at the same time; for we have authentick dates that a great many were depos'd in the months following. The testimony therefore of *Stow* is here produc'd to no purpose, and carries no weight with it, because he does not affirm what they would have him; and if he did, he would evidently be detected of falshood.

It is therefore certain, that the act of *Parker's* Ordination as produc'd out of the Registers, is authentick; that the story of the *Cheapside* Ordination is ridiculous; that the hearsay story, of an unknown Person, ought not to be brought in competition with the acts that remain in the Registers; that considering the testimony it self as testimony, yet one should rather credit the affirmation of the Earl of *Nottingham*, High Admiral of *England*, who was present at the Ceremony, and was at the Dinner given at the Palace of *Lambeth*, than

<sup>b</sup> *Strype's Annals*, Tom. 3. p. 143.

that of a Person so little noted at *Neal*; and the several remarkable falshoods found in this account of *Neal's*, which in other respects contradicts all the publick Records, there is not the least room to hesitate with respect to the preference to be given, whether to this truth, or to the aforementioned fable; for this pretended Narration of *Champney* has all the marks of being such.

Let us add, before we finish upon this head, that as falshood cannot support it self but by falshood, so to support the story of the *Nagshead*, recourse has been had to a forg'd testimony, namely, to that of the Bishop of *Durham*, born three years after the Consecration of *Parker*, and whom they believed to have been dead when they produc'd his testimony; but it appears by the pieces which we have publish'd among the Records annex'd to this Treatise, that this testimony is disown'd by the Bishop himself, and by several Lords of Parliament, both Spiritual and Temporal, who have been witnesses to the truth of the Ordination, as we have set it forth, extracted from the publick Registers.

p. 356.

---

### CHAP. III.

*Barlow, Parker's Consecrator, was himself consecrated. Proofs of this Consecration.*

**A**S few people at present dispute the authentickness of the *Acts* that prove *Parker's* Ordination, so those that attack the validity of the *English* Ordinations, without contesting the truth of the relation that contains the proof and history of the Consecration of that Prelate, who is the head of the new Ministry, pretend to destroy this Ordination by two facts; which if they could be prov'd true, would ruin it past all remedy. The first regards *Barlow, Parker's* consecrator,



secrator, and the other is the form whereby he was consecrated : It is therefore pretended that *Barlow* was himself not consecrated, and that the Ordinal which he made use of is intirely insufficient to ascertain the validity of an Ordination. Either the one or the other of these facts is sufficient of it self to annihilate the *English* Hierarchy. It therefore ought to be examin'd into with a great deal of attention and exactness ; we shall begin with that of *Barlow*.

It remains that we examine whether he was ever consecrated. *M. L'Abbe Renaudot* denies it, or at least intimates in his *Memoire* the considerable doubts which he has upon this head, which is equivalent to his intirely denying it. Three things are principally insisted upon to support this doubt. The *first* is, That *Cranmer's* Register, which contains the Ordinations perform'd by that Prelate, or by his order, mentions nothing at all of *Barlow's*, the act of whose Consecration never was found. The *second* which is reputed demonstrative, is, That in the collection of *Rymer* <sup>c</sup>, there is a Commission of the Queen's address'd to *Parker*, already consecrated Archbishop of *Canterbury*, to confirm and consecrate *Barlow* Bishop of *Chichester* ; now, says he, if he was consecrated when he ordain'd *Parker*, How could *Parker* receive a Commission to consecrate him ? The *third* is, That *Boner* Bishop of *London*, having threatned *Anthony* Bishop of *Landaff* with excommunication, if he meddled in the Ordination of *Parker*, he would not have fail'd to threaten *Barlow* likewise, if he had thought him to have been a Bishop ; and his not having done it, is a proof that he did not believe him such, which he could not be ignorant of if the thing had been true.

But before we proceed to examine these difficulties, it will be convenient to shew the proofs I find of *Barlow's* Consecration. I shall not content my self with the testimony of *Godwin*, which *M. L'Abbe Renaudot* rejects, because this Author is in his opini-

<sup>c</sup> *Rymer*, Tom. 15. p 550.

on not exact. He says positively, <sup>d</sup> That “ *William Barlow*, Prior of the Canons Regular of *Bisham*, “ was consecrated *February 22. 1535*; in the month “ of *April* following he was translated to *St. Davids*.” But not to insist upon this testimony, I proceed to others less suspected, and more certain.

All the World is sufficiently apprised of Mr. *Wharton*’s exactness, the Author of *Anglia Sacra*. Behold what he says of *William Barlow* in the catalogue which he publish’d of the Bishops of *St. Asaph*. “ *William Barlow*, at that time, Prior of the Canons Regular of *Bisham*, of the Order of *St. Augustine*, was “ elected Bishop by the Dean and Chapter of *St. Asaph* in the year 1536, *January* the 16th. On the “ 23d of *February* following he was confirm’d by “ *Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury*.”

The Author of the *Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, who appears to have labour’d with great exactness among the most authentick *Memoires*, expresses himself after the same manner with *Wharton*; <sup>i</sup> *William Barlow* S. T. P. says this Author, writing in *English*, was elected *January 16. 1535. confirm’d February 23d following, &c.* The one and the other really speak but of his Confirmation; yet his Consecration could not long be delayed after his Confirmation, because in an Act made by *Henry* the eighth, it is fix’d to be perform’d within twenty days, without any further delay, under the Penalties of a *Præmunire*: And in the month of *April* following, there is a proof that *Barlow* was already consecrated, as will appear, towards the latter part of this Chapter. Mr. *Strype* also in the life of *Cranmer*, & without any

<sup>d</sup> Gulielmus Barlow, Canonicorum Regularium apud Bisham Prior, consecratus est Februarii 22, 1535. Aprili deinde mense sequente Meneviam translatus est. Godwin. de Præsul. Angliæ, p. 663.

<sup>e</sup> Gulielmus Barlow tunc Prior Canonicorum Regularium de Bisham Ordinis Augustiniani à Decano & Capitulo Assavenfi in Episcopum electus Anno 1536. Januarii 16. a Thoma Archiepiscopo Cantuar. die 23<sup>o</sup> Februarii sequentis confirmatus est.

<sup>f</sup> *Fasti Ecclesiæ Angl.* p. 27.

<sup>g</sup> *Cranmer’s Memorials*, p. 37.

hesitation, places the Consecration of *Barlow* in the year 1535, at the same time observing that the Record of it was not inserted in the Registers, any more than the Consecration of *Edward Fox* was for the Bishoprick of *Hereford*, which was perform'd in the same year; the act of whose Consecration was elsewhere discover'd, according to the Author of the *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*.

The silence of *Cranmer's* Register is therefore no decisive proof of the omission of this Consecration: For, as it is very well observ'd by *Francis Mason*, in his *Defence*<sup>h</sup> of the Ministry of the Church of England, there are a great many others who have also been omitted, whose Consecrations are no less certain for that reason: For instance, *Gardiner's* Consecration cannot be found in the Registers of *Canterbury*, and is it the less certain for that reason? And the Consecration of *Fox*, as I have observ'd, was likewise omitted: If the Record, which was elsewhere found, had not appear'd, Was there more reason to call it in question, because the Register makes no mention of it? One does not find any notice taken in *Cranmer's* Register of the Ordination of *King* Suffragan Bishop of *Lincoln*<sup>i</sup>; we do not nevertheless dispute but that he was really ordain'd, and that it was perform'd in the year 1541. The Author of a Letter lately publish'd touching the succession of the *English* Bishops, and who, himself, has consulted the Registers of *Canterbury*, gives an account of a great number of omissions of the same kind: For, according to him, without mentioning *Fox* and *Gardiner's* Consecrations, which are not found at all, How many others were there omitted? <sup>k</sup> "We confess," says this Author, "That the Consecration of *Barlow* is not to

E 2

be

<sup>h</sup> *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae*. lib. 3. c. 10. p. 369.

*Cranmer's Memorials*, p. 95.

<sup>k</sup> *Fatetur in Registro Cranmeri non reperiri consecrationem Barloii, sed nec aliorum plurimorum Episcoporum, de quorum tamen Ordinatione nunquam*



52 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

“ be found in *Cranmer's Register*, no more are there  
 “ those of several other Bishops, whose Ordinations  
 “ have hitherto been never disputed by any body  
 “ such as *Fox Bishop of Hereford, Sampson of Chiche-*  
 “ *ster, Bell of Worcester, Day of Chichester*, whose Con-  
 “ secrations, if I have not too hastily run over the  
 “ Register, are intirely omitted. What shall I say of  
 “ *Gardiner Bishop of Winchester, Latimer of Worcester,*  
 “ *White of Lincoln, Bayne of Lichfield, Turberville of*  
 “ *Exeter, Hopton of Norwich, Goldwell of St. Asaph,*  
 “ whose Confirmations and Consecrations, if I am  
 “ not very much mistaken, are not to be found now  
 “ in the Archiepiscopal Registers? ” Silence is there-  
 fore no convincing proof, when in other respects there  
 are positive *facts* that supply this, as there are in  
 this case.

There might, perhaps, be some objection made to  
 these authorities, because Mr. *Wharton* places *Barlow's*  
 Consecration in the year 1536, whereas all the others  
 mention it 1535. but this difference proceeds only from  
 a different way of computation, Mr. *Wharton* beginning  
 the year according to the new style, with the 1st of *Ja-*  
*nuary*, must therefore have plac'd it in 1536, whereas the  
 others following the *English* account, which begins the  
 year on the 25th of *March*, could do no otherwise than  
 fix it in 1535, because the Consecration being in the  
 month of *February*, the year 1536 was not yet begun.

Nothing in these cases is more easy to reconcile  
 than Authors who seem to contradict one another

quam adhuc à quoquam fuit dubitatum ; Foxii Herefordensis  
 Episcopi, Sampsonis Cicestrensis, Belli Wigornienfis, Daili Cice-  
 strenfis, quorum omnium consecrationes aut ego festinan-  
 admodum illum Registrum percurri, aut in eo plane desidera-  
 tur. Quid dicam de Gardinero Wintonienfi, de Latimer  
 Wigornienfi, de Whiteo Lincolnienfi, de Bayno Lichfeldienfi,  
 de Turbervillo Exonienfi, Hoptono Norwicensi, Goldwello A-  
 phenfi Episcopis ; quorum aut ego egregiè fallor, aut nec con-  
 firmati, nec consecrati in Registris Archiepiscopalibus hoc tem-  
 pore habentur ? Vide de Vera & non Interrupta Episc. A-  
 Successione, p. 16.

But they'll say : How can the writer of *Cranmer's Life*<sup>1</sup> be reconcil'd, with other writers, who place the Consecration on the twenty sixth of *September*, 1535? I own 'tis not to be attempted, it being a plain Error : For the *Conge D'Eslire* bears date the seventh of *January*<sup>m</sup> 153<sup>5</sup>/<sub>6</sub> ; the Election was made the sixteenth ; the Mandate to confirm and consecrate bears date the twenty second of *February*. What led this Author into his mistake is, that having plac'd *Fox Bishop of Hereford's*<sup>n</sup> Consecration on the twenty sixth of *September* 1535, and being about to make known that the instrument of it had not been inserted in the Register, any more than that of *Barlow's* ; he has forgot to set down the Consecration of the latter, but mentions both together, as if they had so happen'd.

But not to insist any more on these authorities, there are *facts* still more evident, which ascertain *Barlow's* Consecration. 1. *M. L'Abbe Renaudot*, and all the rest agree that in *Henry the eighth's* reign, there was no innovation made in the Ceremonies of Consecration of Bishops, only in the point of swearing Obedience to the *Pope*. Nay further, by a Law made in the twenty fifth year of this King, that is to say, in 1533, and consequently before *Barlow's* Consecration, ° all Archbishops, and Bishops, to

E 3

whom

<sup>1</sup> It is a misfortune that must attend ordinary Readers, in their perusal of the several laborious tracts publish'd by Mr. Strype, to be led into Errors ; few writers having committed more Mistakes than he has done, which weak or malicious adversaries may one time or other make ill uses of. His writings will not always fall into the hands of such candid, judicious readers as our Author is ; and therefore it would be an act of great charity, or rather justice to the publick, and reputation to himself, to review what he has already written ; for I have ocular demonstration that his very numerous escapes would make a competent Volume. Would he take leave of the World with his retractions, how beneficent, how praiseworthy an attempt would that be ? I can promise him large Collections on this subject. Here is a complication of mistakes detected by our dispassionate Author D. W. <sup>m</sup> Rymer, Tom. 14. p. 558. <sup>n</sup> *Cranmer's Memorials*, p. 37. ° Stat. at large, Tom. 1. p. 426.

## 54 A DEFENCE of the Validity

whom the King's Mandate for Consecration is directed are forbid, under pain of a *Pramunire*, to delay it beyond the term of 20 days after the receipt of the Mandate. *Ut si quis Archiepiscopus vel Episcopus intra 20 dies post acceptas litteras patentes Regias Electum non consecraret, idque omnibus debitis adhibitis circumstantiis, in pœnam de Pramunire incideret.* Is it therefore likely that *Barlow* should exercise the Office of a Bishop, during the remainder of that Prince's life, which was more than ten years, without any trouble given either to himself, or the Bishops, to whom the Mandate had been directed; which Mandate bore date the twenty second of *February* 1535, as appears by the Instrument to be found in *Rymer's* \* *Collections*?

p. 399 2. P I here omit the proof produc'd by some people in favour of *Barlow's* Ordination, taken from his restitution to his temporalities; which restitution is not ordinarily granted till after the Consecration is certified by the Metropolitan to the King: But since the Kings of *England* often dispensed with this usage, the argument is too weak not to be contested by those who are interested to confute the most solid Arguments. But as for that drawn from the custom of the Bishops not sitting in Parliament until after their Consecration, this is what I must not omit; since, if it is not absolutely demonstrative, it is at least solid enough to form the strongest presumption in favour of *Barlow's* Consecration.

3. In short, it is an indisputable fact, that altho' before *Edward the third's* time there are some Examples of Bishops sitting in Parliament before their Consecration, there is not one to be found of their sitting there after his time, that is to say, for the space of 400 years; and all the *English* writers look upon the

\* *Rymer. Tom. 14. p. 559.* P Here the learned Author has thought fit to cancel somewhat more than two Pages, beginning at 2° in p. 51. of the French Edition, and substituted this short Paragraph in their stead.



refuse of it to have, in some measure, the force of a Law. The Author of the *Polity of the Church of England* set down, in express Words, this Order, <sup>9</sup> *Confirmati consecrantur; & cum consecrati homagii juramentum Regi præstiterint, & Rex illis vicissim suorum Episcopatum possessiones restituerit — his honoribus potiuntur. Titulum habent Dominorum ratione Baroniarum suis Episcopatibus annexarum, & præcedentiam præ aliis Regni Baronibus non modo in privatis congressibus, sed in supremo Regni Concilio, Parlamento.* First the Consecration next the Homage; after this the investiture of their Possessions; and lastly, the enjoyment of the Honours and Prerogatives annex'd to this Dignity.

Archbishop *Bramhall* explains this to us more at large. <sup>1</sup> “The Chapter, says he, cannot elect without the King’s *Conge D’Eslire*. The King never grants Letters Patents for Confirmation and Consecration, until he have a certificate of the Dean and Chapter’s election. The Dean of the Arches never confirms until he have the King’s Commission. The Archbishop never consecrates until the Election be confirm’d. And lastly, the King never receiveth Homage for the Bishoprick, or giveth the Temporalities, nor the Dean and Chapter enthrone till after the Consecration.” And the Bishop cannot perform his ordinary Jurisdiction, but as he is a consecrated Bishop, and after being invested.

Bishop *Burnet*, who ought to have been well acquainted with this custom, testifies the same in his *History* <sup>2</sup>. The rule is, according to him, That to have a seat in the House of Lords, he must present the King’s Writ, in virtue of which he was put into possession of his Temporalities; and this instrument, as we have seen, could not be obtain’d but upon a certificate of Consecration. I have the same thing confirm’d to me a new, in a Letter from *Daniel Pultney*, Esq; one of my

E 4

my

<sup>9</sup> Polit. Ecc. Angl. c. 5. p. 39. & 40.

<sup>1</sup> Bramhall’s

*Works*, p. 482.

<sup>2</sup> Burnet’s *Hist. Reformation*, Tom. 2.

p. 404.

## 56 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

my Friends, of the twenty seventh of *March*, 1721. It says, That tho' there be no exprefs law for it, yet 'tis the constant custom of the Country not to admit the Bishops to their seats in the House of Lords, until after their Consecration. Another Letter from a learned *English* Man makes this appear also; and adds, that the custom of that Kingdom is, that when the new Bishop is not yet confirm'd, he is not summon'd to Parliament; and a proper Person is appointed by the Archbishop, during the vacancy of the See, to exercise spiritual Jurisdiction; who, in *England*, is styl'd guardian of the Spiritualities. Now, in all the Convocations and Sessions of Parliament, held under *Henry* the eighth, from the year 1536, *Barlow* was always summon'd with the rest, and was present in them, not as guardian of the Spiritualities, nor yet as Bishop elect, and confirm'd, but as a Bishop without restriction, and even took place of other Bishops, who indisputably had been consecrated. In *Rymer's* Collections \* we have two instruments for calling Parliaments, one in 1536, the other 1541; both in the one and the other, the Bishop of *St. Davids*, who then was *Barlow*, is summon'd like the rest; he must necessarily then have been consecrated before the month of *April* 1536. For the Parliament of this year was summon'd the the twenty seventh of *April*. *Mason* <sup>u</sup> also says, That in the Parliament of 1539, *Barlow* then Bishop of *St. Davids*, made his appearance in Person twenty seven times the first Session, and fifteen times in the second. He was therefore consecrated before, and this fact is not to be doubted of.

4. The Convocation met at the same time with the Parliament of 1536, where several propositions were presented in order to be condemn'd; besides some articles were drawn up, which the King caused to be publish'd in his name; a list of them was subscrib'd

\* *Rymer*. Tom. 14. p. 563. & 737.  
Eycl. p. 368.

<sup>u</sup> *Masoni Vindiciæ*

by eighteen Bishops, among the rest *Barlow's* name appears in quality of Bishop of *St. Davids* <sup>x</sup>. His name is even plac'd before *Robert Warton's* Bishop of *St. Asaph*, who was consecrated the 2<sup>d</sup> of *July* 1536. *Barlow* was therefore consecrated before him, seeing that under *Henry* the eighth, in whose time the ecclesiastical rules of this kind were very exactly observ'd, he never would have held this rank in the Convocation, nor sign'd before a consecrated Bishop, he not being consecrated himself. Moreover, he was present at the several *Synods* of <sup>y</sup> 1537, 1540, and 1552, and subscribed in each in quality of Bishop of *St. Davids* and *Bath*, and no opposition appears to have been made upon the account of his Consecration. Would he therefore have been allow'd to have taken place and subscrib'd before consecrated Bishops, and himself not consecrated? And much more since the constant custom <sup>z</sup> of *England* is, not to admit into its *Synods* Bishops who are not consecrated, or if admitted, they sit below the consecrated Bishops; nor do they take the name of Bishops without restriction, but simply that of Bishops *elect* and confirm'd, both when they subscribe, and in the summons sent to them.

5. But here is something stronger: There is a *Mandate* in *Cranmer's* Register, for the consecrating *Arthur Buckley* Bishop of *Bangor*. The ceremony was performed the 19th of *February* <sup>a</sup> 154<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>, namely, in the reign of *Henry* the eighth, under whom the ancient ecclesiastical laws were still exactly observ'd in the Consecration of Bishops, and posterior to the law, renewed in the 25th year of his reign, ordering that Bishops should not be consecrated by less than three Bishops. <sup>b</sup> "It is order'd, says *Sanders*, that no person elected a Bishop should obtain pontifical Bulls, or apostolical  
" Man-

<sup>x</sup> Collier's *Eccl. History* of Great Britain, tom. 2 p. 126 and 127.

<sup>y</sup> See the institution of a christen Man.

<sup>z</sup> See the Records in the

Appendix.

<sup>a</sup> *Fasti Eccles. Angl.* p. 27.

<sup>b</sup> *Decrevit ne*

*quisquam electus in Episcopum Bullas pontificias seu Mandatum Apostolicum de consecratione requireret, sed regium tantum diploma*



58 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

“ Mandates for Consecration, but should only exhibit the King’s Mandate ; according to which, he being ordain’d by three Bishops, with the consent of the Metropolitan, by act of Parliament, in conformity to the ancient canons, he is to be reputed a true Bishop; nor was any one otherwise ordain’d, to be acknowledg’d as such.” It is without doubt understood, that the three consecrating Bishops should themselves have been first consecrated; since, as *Sanders* takes notice, *Henry* the eighth did in this but renew the ancient canons of the church, *ad imitationem antiquorum canonum*.

Now by the *Canterbury Register*, it is evident that *Barlow* in 154 $\frac{1}{2}$ , was one of *Buckley’s* Consecrators, who, according to *Cranmer’s* Mandate<sup>c</sup>, was consecrated by *John* Bishop of *Salisbury*, *William* Bishop of *St. David’s*, and *John* Bishop of *Glocester*<sup>d</sup>. Would a Bishop not consecrated, have been suffer’d in those times to officiate on such a solemnity, and even to have the precedency of the Bishop of *Gloucester*, who had been consecrated four months before<sup>e</sup>?

6. It further appears by *Parker’s* Register, that at the very first Ordination perform’d by that Prelate, viz. on the 21st of *December* 1559, *Barlow* was one of the Consecrators: Now if he had not been consecrated, why was he not consecrated along with the rest? And can there be any other reason assign’d for not doing it, but that given by the author of *Parker’s* life; “<sup>f</sup> *Scory* and *Barlow*, says he, being Bishops before, needed no Consecration, but were confirm’d in their new Bishopricks the day before, being *St. Thomas’s* Eve.”

diploma adferret, secundum quod a tribus Episcopis cum consensu Metropolitæ ordinatus, jubebatur lege comitiorum facta ad imitationem antiquorum canonum, esse verus Episcopus; nec alio modo ordinatum pro Episcopo agnosci oportere. *Sanders de Schismate Anglicano*, lib. 3. p. 348.

<sup>c</sup> This commission or mandate you will find cited in a letter among the proofs in the Appendix.

<sup>d</sup> *Cranmer’s* memorials, p. 95.

<sup>e</sup> Fasti Eccl. Ang. p. 101.

<sup>f</sup> *The life of Parker*, p. 65.

7. A fresh proof of *Barlow's* Consecration may be drawn from an instrument that is found in the *Canterbury Registers*. In 1554<sup>g</sup>, when *Queen Mary* came to the crown, some of the Protestant Bishops, apprehensive of persecution, left the kingdom, and travell'd into foreign countries. If *Barlow* had not been consecrated, doubtless the See had been declar'd vacant, *ob nullitatem consecrationis ejus*, as is said of *Taylor* Bishop of *Lincoln*<sup>h</sup>. Nevertheless, in the commission drawn up by the Chapter of *Canterbury* for the government of the church of *Bath*, during the vacancy of the See, it is said to be vacant, *per liberam & spontaneam resignationem D. W. Barloo ultimi Episcopi & Pastoris ejusdem*: "By the free and voluntary resignation of *William Barlow* the last Bishop and Pastor of that church." This same clause is found in the *Conge d'Eslire* directed to the Chapter of *Bath*, by *Queen Mary*, dated the 13th of March 1554; *Per liberam & spontaneam resignationem in manus nostras ultimi Episcopi ibidem*<sup>i</sup>. And in the act of investiture assigned to his successor, the same words appear: Now this has never been the style given to any but to consecrated Bishops.

It is true that the Mandate to confirm and consecrate his successor *Bourne*, runs that the See was vacant, *per deprivationem & amotionem ultimi Episcopi ibidem*, "by the deprivation and removal of the last Bishop of that See." But it is visible that these terms are here used<sup>k</sup> to leave him without all hopes of a restoration. A sentence also was past to deprive him of his Bishoprick, which had been omitted as unnecessary, if it had not been known that he was consecrated. In short, that which proves that the See was really vacant by dismissal, and not any failure of Consecration, is that in the instrument for his successors investiture, and *posterior* by more than a month to the sentence suppos'd to have been pass'd, it is

<sup>g</sup> Ant. Harmer, p. 135.  
tom. 15. p. 369.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. p. 133.

<sup>i</sup> Rymer,

<sup>k</sup> See the letters in my Appendix.

again said the See was vacant by *Barlow's* resignation *per liberam resignationem ultimi Episcopi ibidem*. And in the Register of *Canterbury*, the See is declar'd vacant by the resignation which *Barlow* was oblig'd to make upon the account of his being married, *Bathon. & Well. vacavit per resignationem Williel. Barlow conjugati, cui successit Gilbertus Bourne*. All these facts are to be found among my proofs, from which an argument doth arise, which may be look'd upon as a demonstration. For since a vacancy by resignation supposes the resigning Bishop consecrated, and the deposition is assign'd to his marriage, and not to failure of Consecration, it evidently follows that these Records which prove *Barlow's* resignation or deposition, do as evidently prove his Consecration. Thus stand the facts and the proofs as they still exist; there is no room consequently to doubt of *Barlow's* Consecration.

8. Finally, one masterly proof of this Consecration, and which is of no less force than the rest, tho' a negative one, is drawn from the silence observed upon this subject at the time *Barlow* was accused of Heresy for denying the necessity of Ordination. In short, is there one author for the space of seventy years, that has accus'd him of usurping the title of a Bishop without having been consecrated? Was it ever objected to him during the thirty years he was a Bishop, that he had exercis'd that dignity without receiving the character of it? Have not both Catholics and Protestants acknowledg'd him a true Bishop? And is he not suppos'd consecrated in the sentence for depriving him? In a word, is there the least acknowledgment, or the least authentick testimony in those times to support an accusation which is only founded upon the want of an instrument, the loss of which may be ascribed to an infinity of causes, and which would be no prejudice to any other Consecration but *Barlow's*, tho' the loss be common to many other Bishops besides him? Let who will believe it, for the omission of reproaches



## *of the* English ORDINATIONS. 61

proaches and accusations in this case, is infinitely more favourable to *Barlow's* Consecration than the loss of such an instrument can be hurtfull. But altho' all these separate proofs should not appear so convincing as they really are, the putting them together forms a presumption so strong in favour of *Barlow's* Consecration, that it may pass for a demonstration, without its receiving the least damage from the loss of the instrument.

---

### CHAP. IV.

*An Answer to the Reasons alledg'd on the other side. The publick Instruments prove nothing against Barlow's Consecration.*

THE first reason insisted upon, is drawn from the impossibility of finding the instrument of his Consecration. This has already been answer'd before hand by producing several instruments which abundantly supply the loss of that one. For a negative argument has weight only so far, where nothing is brought to supply the testimonials judg'd necessary. Now the instrument in question is here supply'd in several respects. 1. By the positive testimonies of *Godwin, Wharton*, and some others. 2. By instruments which, according to the laws and government of the church of *England*, all suppose a Consecration; such is the investiture, the seat in parliament, the Consecration of other Bishops, and other episcopal functions, proofs of which have been sufficiently produc'd. 3. By the silence of the other side, which makes more for the Consecration than what they can say against it prejudicial; and this silence is prov'd by *Barlow's* having never been reproach'd with the want of Consecration either by his Prince, or by his own church, or even by the Catholicks; and because the ancient  
Bishops

Bishops who refus'd to acknowledge the new Consecrations, yet they alledg'd nothing against *Barlow's*: But when they observed only the deficiencies of the new forms, and the non-observation of the laws of the realm in these first Ordinations, *Barlow's* ordination was then allow'd of, and was contested by no soul at that time, tho' the argument against the new Bishops would have been decisive against him, if supported by the least shadow of truth. 4. By the acknowledgment even of his enemies who own'd him a Bishop by calling him brother, by receiving his resignation, and who in the sentence of deprivation have given him the title of *ultimus illius sedis Episcopus*, last Bishop of that See; which they would never have done, had he not been consecrated. 5. And lastly, by examples of the like omissions in Bishops whose Ordinations were never question'd, tho' there be no footsteps of the act of Consecration being register'd, or otherwise to be met with; why therefore must *Barlow's* Ordination be doubted of rather than that of others?

From all this I conclude, that the loss of the instrument of *Barlow's* Consecration cannot in the least prejudice it, because silence has weight only where no instrument opposite to it is produc'd to destroy it. Now in the present affair, this silence is destroy'd, or, to speak more properly, is supply'd by a number of Records that attest the Ordination; no conclusion consequently can be drawn against *Barlow's* Consecration from the want of the Register of it.

But, says *Champney*<sup>1</sup>, all he did was without Power, and simply as an *Usufructuary*, and all his functions prove nothing, because he might have perform'd the same without being a Bishop. It is almost needless to answer such reasons as these. If I should produce the instrument demanded, what can hinder such adversaries from pretending that it is supposititious? From sustaining that it has been since forg'd? From

<sup>1</sup> De vocatione Ministr. p. 491.

saying the Registers have been adulterated, and that what comes from a suspected hand must pass for nothing? There is no historical fact whatsoever proof against such obstinacy. When the truth of instruments is deny'd merely from the interest we have they should be false, there is an end of all disputes. This is only the last refuge of those that have no reasons to produce. The instrument of *Parker's* consecration must be false, because there is a necessity for it to sustain the *cause*; the *good of the same cause* requires that if *Barlow's* were produc'd, it is to be believed it would have the same fate. But let the instrument be lost or found, it is sufficient to render his Consecration indisputable, that he could not have hid it, or omitted it, without exposing himself to the reproaches of the publick, and that notwithstanding he always perform'd the episcopal functions without its being objected to him as a crime, at a time even when it imported them most to dispute the legality of his Episcopacy. Besides, how to reconcile the quality of an *Usufructuary* with the *Conge d'Eslire*, the Mandates for his Confirmation and Consecration, the Acts of investiture, farming, and alienating, all functions annex'd to this character by the laws of the kingdom, let any one believe this that pleases, for my part I see not the least shadow of probability in it.

The second reason appears stronger, because this silence appears to be supported by some instruments which seem to determine that *Barlow* had never been consecrated. The first is *Queen Elizabeth's* Mandate directed to *Matthew Parker* in 1559, to install *Barlow* in the See of *Chichester*, wherein she orders him to be consecrated; <sup>m</sup> *Regina, &c. Rogantes---& Mandantes quatenus eundem Mag. Will. Barloo Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, cæteraque omnia & singula peragere velitis.* The intire instrument is to be found in the Appendix among my proofs. From whence

p. 369

<sup>m</sup> Rymer, tom. 15. p. 550.



## 64 A DEFENCE of the Validity

it is concluded, if *Barlow* had been already consecrated in 1536, the Queen would not have order'd *Parker* in 1559 to consecrate him again.

This proof of *Barlow's* want of Consecration, becomes so much the more urgent, because that merely upon translating Bishops already consecrated, *Rymer's* collections furnishes us with several instruments where the Mandate impowers the Metropolitan, simply to confirm and invest, and not to consecrate; this is apparent by the instruments<sup>n</sup> of *Thirlby's* Translation to the Bishoprick of *Ely*, by *Grindal's* to the Archbishoprick of *York*, *Sandy's* to the Bishoprick of *London*, *Barnes* to the Bishoprick of *Carlisle*, *Geast* to the Bishoprick of *Salisbury*, *Freak* to the Bishoprick of *Norwich*, and by many others which give only a power to confirm, authorize, inthronize, invest<sup>o</sup>; and reserve the term *consecrare* for those who were not as yet Bishops, as appears by the Mandates<sup>p</sup> drawn up for *Richard Davies*, *Rowland Merick*, *Richard Cox*, *John Jewel*, *Henry Morgan*, *Nicholas Bullingham*, *William Alley*, and an hundred more, whose instruments are found in *Rymer's* copious collections.

This second reason alone appears decisive to *Monsieur L'Abbe Renaudot*, believing falsely that the facts it is founded upon are incontestable, and supposing without reason, that *Barlow's* Consecration effectually follow'd the Mandate directed to *Parker*, dated the eighteenth of *December* 1559, to consecrate him. This reason would utterly defeat the maintainers of *Barlow's* Consecration, if the exactness of the instrument could be warranted; and if besides the same collection which furnishes us with this, did not at the same time supply us with what destroys it, and to demonstrate that the terms which make the difficulty, are but a matter of style which has often been neglected by the Secretaries.

<sup>n</sup> *Rymer*, tom. 15. p. 404, 681, 683, 684, 699, 749. <sup>o</sup> Confirmare, autorizare, inthronizare, investire. <sup>p</sup> *Rymer*, tom. 15. p. 551, 552, 555, 561, 589.

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 65

To prove this, there are two convincing means. The *First*, That in several Mandates directed to the Metropolitans, to confirm the translation of Bishops already consecrated, the term *Consecrare* is to be found, as if they had not been already consecrated. And *Secondly*, That in other Mandates exhibited to confirm and consecrate new Bishops *elect*, the term *Consecrare* has been omitted, as if they had been already consecrated. This reason therefore, which at first appear'd decisive, falls of it self; and to destroy it utterly, we need only produce the *facts* dispers'd about in *Rymer's Collections*.

In 1534, *John Capon*, or *Salcot* was consecrated Bishop of *Bangor*, April the nineteenth, which is prov'd by *Cranmer's Register*. <sup>a</sup> The assistant Bishops Names are even found there, who were the Bishops of *Lincoln*, and *Sidon*. In 1539 this same Bishop was translated to *Salisbury*. All this was under *Henry* the eighth, when it would not be advisable to disallow the Ordinations perform'd by *Cranmer* since the Schism. Nevertheless, in the Mandate address'd to this Prelate, to confirm the removal of the Bishop of *Bangor* to *Salisbury*, it is directed that he should consecrate him <sup>r</sup>, *Firmiter vobis mandantes quatenus prefatum Johannem Capon Sarum Electum, & Electionem predictam confirmare, & eundem in Episcopum Sarum Consecrare, prout moris est, ceteraque peragere, &c.*

In 1544, *Nicholas Heath* Bishop of *Rochester* was remov'd to *Worcester* by *Henry* the eighth. He had been consecrated the fourth of April 1540, by the Bishops of *Winchester*, *Chichester*, *St. Asaph* and *Hereford*, by a Mandate from *Cranmer*; <sup>r</sup> nevertheless, in the Letters to confirm the Bishop in his new See, it is said, he should be consecrated. <sup>t</sup> *Quocirca vobis mandamus quod cetera omnia quæ per vos ad confirmationem & consecrationem ejusdem in dicto Episcopatu fieri consueverunt — facere velit is.*

<sup>a</sup> *Cranmer's Memorials*. p. 30.

641.

<sup>r</sup> *Cranmer's Memorials*, p. 90.

15. p. 12.

<sup>t</sup> *Rymer*, Tom. 14. p.

<sup>t</sup> *Rymer*, Tom.

## 66 A DEFENCE of the Validity

Henry Holbeche Bishop of Rochester <sup>u</sup>, was consecrated the eighteenth of June 1544. He was translated to Lincoln in 1547, and notwithstanding, the Mandate to Cranmer, as if he had not been already consecrated, directs that he should perform all things requisite for the new Elect'd's Confirmation and Consecration. <sup>x</sup> *Ad confirmationem & consecrationem.*

In 1584, William Wickham was made Bishop of Lincoln <sup>y</sup>, and consecrated the sixth of December in the same year; he was translated to Winchester in 1595. It was no more necessary that he should be again consecrated, for that had been done already; nevertheless, the Mandate to Whitgift carries an order with it to invest and consecrate him <sup>z</sup>. *Quatenus vos prædictum — Electum investire & consecrare velit.*

In 1595, Matthew Hutton Bishop of Durham was remov'd to York; he had been consecrated Bishop of Durham on the twenty seventh of July 1589 <sup>a</sup>. Nevertheless, in the Mandate to Whitgift for his Installation, he is order'd to confirm, to invest, and to consecrate him <sup>b</sup>. *Electionem prædictam confirmare, ac eundem Archiepiscopum, & Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ investire & consecrare.*

Hugh Bellot, or Billett, was consecrated Bishop of Bangor on the thirtieth of January 1585 <sup>c</sup>. He was translated to Chester in 1595. The Letters Patents to inthronize him are directed to the Archbishop of York, and, as if he had never had consecration, they order it should be perform'd. <sup>d</sup> *Et eundem Hugonem Episcopum & Pastorem sedis prædictæ consecrare.*

This Bishop held his Bishoprick but two years. Richard Vaughan, who succeeded him in the See of Bangor, succeeded him also to that of Chester in 1597.

<sup>u</sup> Reg. Cranmer, & Fast. Ecc. Angl. p. 251.

Tom. 15. p. 153.

Angl. p. 142.

Eccl. Angl. p. 350.

Life of Whitgift, p. 245.

<sup>y</sup> The Life of Whitgift. p. 15. & Fasti Eccl.

<sup>z</sup> Rymer, Tom. 16. p. 259.

<sup>b</sup> Rymer, Tom. 16. p. 270.

<sup>d</sup> Rymer, Tom. 16. p. 281.

<sup>x</sup> Rymer,

<sup>a</sup> Fasti

<sup>c</sup> The



## of the English ORDINATIONS. 67

He had been consecrated Bishop of *Bangor* the twenty fifth of *January* 1596<sup>e</sup>, and yet the Mandate to the Archbishop of *York* to confirm his translation, and to install him in that new See, says he must be consecrated : <sup>f</sup> *Eumdem Richardum Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cestriensis prædictæ consecrare.*

In short, not to heap here a great number of examples, *John Thornborough* was translated from *Limerick* to *Bristol*, and he had been already consecrated ; nevertheless, the Commission to *Whitgift* <sup>g</sup> directs, that he should be confirm'd and consecrated ; *confirmare & consecrare* ; but the Consecration was not perform'd, because, as the Author of *Whitgift's* <sup>h</sup> Life observes, he was already consecrated.

But if in the Mandates exhibited by the Prince to the Metropolitans, the term *consecrare* is often found when unnecessary ; so when it was necessary, it has often been omitted, that is, when it regarded those who never had been consecrated. This same Collection of *Rymer's* furnishes us with many proofs of this equally authentick.

In 1571, *Thomas Cowper* Dean of *Christ-Church Oxford*, was nam'd to the Bishoprick of *Lincoln* by Queen *Elizabeth* ; he had not been before consecrated, but he was on the twenty fourth of *February* of the same year <sup>i</sup>. However, in the Mandate to *Parker*, to confirm and consecrate the new Bishop, there is no mention of the Consecration. <sup>k</sup> *Mandantes quatenus vos — electionem illam confirmare, & eumdem Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ, autorizare, & investire, ceteraque omnia peragere — Velitis.*

*William Bradbrige* Dean of *Salisbury* was, in the same year, elected Bishop of *Exeter*, and according to *Parker's* <sup>l</sup> Register was consecrated the eighteenth of *March*, 157½. The Mandate for his Consecration is

<sup>e</sup> *The Life of Whitgift.* p. 487.

<sup>f</sup> *Rymer*, Tom. 16. p.

<sup>g</sup> *Ibid.* p. 519.

<sup>h</sup> *The Life of Whitgift*, p. 584.

<sup>i</sup> *The Life of Parker*, p. 316.

<sup>k</sup> *Rymer*, Tom. 15. p. 316.

<sup>l</sup> *The Life of Parker*, p. 316.

## 68 A DEFENCE of the Validity

dated on the twenty sixth of the preceding *February*, and there is no more mention made in it of the Consecration, than there would, if it had been already perform'd. There is no mention but as in the former of authorizing and investing : *Autorizare & investire* <sup>m</sup>.

In 1573, *William Hughes* Doctor in Divinity was nam'd to the Bishoprick of *St. Asaph*, and was consecrated the thirteenth of *December* the same year <sup>n</sup>; yet in the Mandate directed to *Parker* for his Consecration, mention is only made as in the former, of authorizing and investing, *autorizare & investire* <sup>o</sup>.

In 1577, *John May* Doctor in Divinity was elected Bishop of *Carlisle*, and was consecrated the twenty ninth of *September* <sup>p</sup>. Nevertheless, in the Mandate dated the ninth of *August* preceding, and directed to *Sandys* Archbishop of *York*; the Consecration is not directed, or at least very implicitly. *Electionem prædictam confirmare, cæteraque omnia & singula peragere & perimplere* <sup>q</sup>.

*Toby Matthews* was nominated Bishop of *Durham* in 1595 <sup>r</sup>; he was not before consecrated, being only, when he was appointed, Professor of Divinity; nevertheless, in the Mandate directed to *Hutton* Archbishop of *York* to consecrate him, there is no mention made of Consecration, but simply of Confirmation and Institution. <sup>r</sup> *Electionem prædictam confirmare, & eundem — Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ instituire, cæteraque omnia & singula facere, &c.*

More examples would be needless : And, supposing the Instrument produc'd by *Rymer* to be faithfully transcrib'd, these would be sufficient to demonstrate the term *Consecrare*, found in the Mandate to install *Barlow* in the Bishoprick of *Chichester*, would not prove he had not been consecrated before ; for, in short, the use or omission of this expression, can prove

<sup>m</sup> *Rymer*, Tom. 15. p. 690.

<sup>o</sup> *Rymer*, Tom. 15. p. 726.

<sup>q</sup> *Rymer*, Tom. 15. p. 780.

<sup>r</sup> *Rymer*, Tom. 16. p. 272.

<sup>n</sup> *The Life of Parker*, p. 458.

<sup>p</sup> *Fasti Eccl. Angl.* p. 338.

<sup>r</sup> *Fasti Eccl. Anglic.* p. 350.

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 69

nothing against *Barlow*, if it has been us'd where it was useless, and omitted where it was necessary. Now it is evident from the *Facts* related, and all justified by the most authentick Registers, and Instruments, that this expression has been thus us'd, and thus omitted; and therefore *M. L'Abbe Renaudot's* pretended demonstration falls to the ground, and cannot so much as be the foundation for a conjecture, much more for a conviction.

But not to stop at eluding the force of this Instrument to make it favourable to me; it is only restoring it to its primitive purity, and then instead of being oblig'd to defend *Barlow's* Episcopacy against this piece, the very Instrument it self will become a proof against those who would fain draw some advantage from it against *Barlow*. For a late Author, who has newly consulted both *Parker's* Register, and the Records in the Chapel at the Rolls, from whence *Rymer* had copied this Instrument, assures us, that he has miscited it, and that the term *Consecrare* is not to be found in either of them; but that the Error proceeds solely from *Rymer's* want of exactness in copying the Instrument. I cannot forbear setting down his own Words, tho' a little long, because they are too important to be omitted. " But I  
" shall dwell no longer upon conjectures, says this  
" Author, I positively affirm, that in this case there  
" is no error in the royal Mandate. The fault, be  
" it what it will, was altogether *Rymer's*; who, find-  
" ing seven Mandates together of the same tenor,  
" did not accurately enough observe in what manner

Sed nec ex conjecturis diutius agam, fidenter assero nullum in Mandato Regio, hoc in casu, errorem fuisse; culpa quæcunque fuerit, tota fuit *Rymeri*, qui septem ejusdem prorsus tenoris Mandata simul inspiciens, non satis accurate observavit, eorum quinque utrumque exegisse, scilicet ut Episcopi in illis nominati & confirmarentur & consecrarentur: duo (ea scilicet quæ ad *Barlovium* atque *Scoræum* pertinebant) id solum requisivisse ut confirmarentur--- *De Vera & non Interrupta Episc. Angl. success. Epist.* p. 17.



70 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

“ five of them were exprefs’d ; namely, that the Bi-  
 “ shops nominated in them were both to be confirm’d  
 “ and consecrated ; and that the other two, (*viz.*  
 “ those that belong’d to *Barlow* and *Scory*) required  
 “ only that they should be confirm’d.”

The difference this Author observes between the instruments, evidently confirms the opinion generally receiv’d of *Barlow’s* Consecration ; and to establish the proof of this difference, he proceeds in these Words,

“ I here appeal to the publick Records as wit-  
 “ nesses ; not only *Parker’s* Register, in which the in-  
 “ strument is faithfully inserted, but the very Roll it  
 “ self, from whence *Rymer* (tho’ erroneously) trans-  
 “ crib’d it. In both which, whatever is found in  
 “ *Rymer* either of *Barlow* or *Scory’s* Consecration, is  
 “ altogether omitted ; nor is there any thing further  
 “ required of the Archbishop, but that he would con-  
 “ firm them Bishops of *Chichester* and *Hereford*. I  
 “ will faithfully transcribe the very Words of the roy-  
 “ al Writ, as they are inserted in the Roll, and in  
 “ the Register, to oblige ill-natur’d Criticks. *Rogantes ac — mandantes, quatenus eundem Mag. Guil.*  
 “ *Barloo in Episcopum & pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis*  
 “ *Cicestrensis prædictæ (sicut præfertur) Electum, electio-*  
 “ *nemque prædictam confirmare, cæteraque omnia per-*  
 “ *agere — Velitis.* What the Queen commanded the

“ *Testes hic appello acta publica, non solum Registrum Parkeri, in quo utrumque instrumentum fideliter inseritur : sed ipsum Rotulum, unde utrumque (licet erroneè) exscripsit Rymerus. In utroque eorum quicquid de consecratione five Barlovii five Scoræi in Rymero legitur, omnino omittitur ; nec aliud quidquam Archiepiscopo demandatur, nisi ut eos in Episcopos Cicestrensem atque Herefordensem confirmaret. Verba ipsa Brevium Regionum prout in Rotulo atque Registro ponuntur, in Aristarchi gratiam fideliter apponam. Rogantes ac --- Mandantes, quatenus eundem Mag. Will. Barloo in Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Cicestrensis prædictæ (sicut præfertur) Electum, electionemque prædictam confirmare, cæteraque omnia peragere --- Velitis. Quod Regina mandavit, præstitit Archiepiscopus : confirmavit utrumque, Barlovium atque Scoræum ; neutrum consecravit, ibid. p. 18.*

“ Arch-

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 71

“ Archbishop perform’d ; he confirm’d both *Barlow* and *Scory*, but consecrated neither.”

It is therefore building in the Air, to found the failure of *Barlow*’s Consecration upon what is an error of the transcriber, disprov’d by an inspection into the very instrument it self, and by the sundry facts relating to this Instrument. For, tho’ the Mandate, as it is worded in *Rymer*, might breed at least a suspicion, yet *Barlow* was not consecrated at that time. Some proof should be brought of *Parker*’s consecrating him, drawn either from *Parker*’s own Register, or some instrument of the like authority : However, neither *Parker*’s Register, nor the Author of his life, nor he that writes the *Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, nor any body else, that I know of, make the least mention of it, and many say the direct contrary ; among others a cotemporary Author, who has written concerning the *Antiquity of the British Church*, &c. who is believ’d to have been *Parker* himself, and whose work was publish’d first at *London* in 1572, during *Parker*’s life, speaks positively only of *Barlow*’s Confirmation, and says nothing of his Consecration \*. “ In the first year of his Consecration, says he, *Parker* consecrated eleven, and confirm’d two Bishops of his Province at *Lambeth* ; the Bishops that were consecrated are these, *Grindal*, *Cox*, *Sandys*, *Jewel*, *Barcley*, *Bentham*, *Merick*, *Young*, *Davies*, *Bullingham*, *Ghest*. In the same year were confirm’d, *William Barlow* in the Bishoprick of *Chichester*, who in the reign of *Edward* the sixth, was Bishop of

\* Primo consecrationis suæ anno, (Parkerus) Lambethi sacra-  
vit undecim, & confirmavit duos in sua Provincia Episco-  
pos. Episcopi qui consecrati fuerunt sunt hi : *Grindal*, *Cox*,  
*Sandys*, *Jewel*, *Barcley*, *Bentham*, *Merick*, *Young*, *Davies*, *Bul-  
lingham*, *Ghest*. Eodem anno confirmati sunt Gulielmus *Bar-  
low*, regnante *Edwardo* Rege, *Bathoniensis* & *Wellensis* Epif-  
copus, ad Episcopatum *Cicestrensem* postulatus, & *Johannes*  
*Scory* à *Cicestrensi* Episcopatu, quem eodem *Edwardo* Rege  
asserat, ad sedem *Herefordensem*. *The Life of M. Parker*, Ap-  
pendix, p. 153, 154.

72 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

“ *Bath and Wells, and John Scory in the See of Hereford, who was translated from Chichester, which he held, in the reign of the said King Edward.*” This life of *Parker’s*, which was annex’d to several Copies of the *Antiquity of the British Church, &c.* in the Edition of 1572, which Mr. *Strype* has re-printed in the Appendix to the life of this Prelate, is not found in the *Hanaw* Edition in 1605 ; but that can do no prejudice to this fact, since there is a Table preserv’d in this last Edition <sup>y</sup> of the Ordinations perform’d by *Parker*, even until the year 1571, wherein it is set down, that he had only confirm’d *Barlow* and *Scory*.

*Cambden*, a well inform’d, and almost a cotemporary writer, whom I have already quoted on the subject, says also in positive Words, that *Parker* only confirm’d *Barlow*. “ He afterwards, says he, consecrated *Edmund Grindal* — He confirm’d likewise “ *William Barlow* in the Bishoprick of *Chichester*, who “ in the days of *Henry* the eighth was Bishop of *St. Davids*, and afterwards of *Bath*, and also *John Scory*, a Man learned and judicious, in the See of “ *Hereford*, who was formerly Bishop of *Chichester*.<sup>z</sup> “ *Godwin*, “ the Author of the *Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, and all others, who had any occasion to mention this translation, say nothing but of the Confirmation, and never of a Consecration ; and no more does the late Author of *Parker’s* life, who has follow’d most faithfully such testimonies as are worthy of belief ; and we find he assures us, <sup>b</sup> “ That *Scory* and *Barlow* being Bishops before, needed no Consecration, “ but were confirm’d in their new Bishopricks the “ day before, being *St. Thomas’s Eve*.” And from all these testimonies united, I form this argument,

<sup>y</sup> Edit. Hanoviæ, p. 37.      <sup>z</sup> Ille postea consecravit Edmundum Grindallum --- Confirmavit autem Gulielmum Barlowum, qui, regnante Henrico Octavo, fuerat Menevensis & postea Bathoniensis, in Cicestrensem, & Johan. Scorium virum erudito judicio, qui prius fuerat Cicestrensis in Herefordensem.

<sup>a</sup> Godwin de Præsulibus Angliæ, p. 562. --- & *Fasti Ecclesiæ Angl.* p. 58.      <sup>b</sup> *The Life of M. Parker*, p. 63.



which *Monsieur Renaudot* could not have made any solid answer to, for it is drawn from his own Principles. That Consecration must be chimerical of which no proof is to be found, of which no instrument is to be had, of which no mention is made, either in the publick Registers, or in any Instruments equivalent to them, and which on the contrary is destroy'd by opposite Instruments and Testimonials. Now such is *Barlow's* pretended Consecration by *Parker*; the only difference between *M. L'Abbe Renaudot's* argument and mine is, that silence is here very pressing without any thing to supply it; nay, on the contrary, every thing strengthens it; but instead of the want of the Instrument of *Barlow's* Consecration by *Cranmer*, there are a number of Instruments, and equivalent Proofs to make it up. Thus all the monuments and testimonies of all the cotemporary and following writers certify, or suppose, *Barlow's* Consecration in the year 1536, that is to say, when he was made Bishop of *St. Asaph*, and that nothing is to be met with that makes us suspect the contrary, unless they will object the two Instruments produc'd by *Rymer*, tho' these Instruments you see might even be insisted upon, if more satisfactory proofs were wanting.

It is said, if *Barlow* was consecrated, it must have been in the month of *April* 1536, since if there be any weight in the proofs alledg'd, they suppose his Consecration at that time; and if he was not then, it is likely he never was at all: Now by two Instruments found in *Rymer's* Collections, <sup>c</sup> it plainly appears, that *Barlow* was not as yet consecrated at that time; these two Instruments are the *Conge D'Eslire* of *Robert Warton* to the Bishoprick of *St. Asaph*, dated the twenty ninth of *May* 1536, and the Mandate directed to *Cranmer* to consecrate him, dated the twenty fourth of *June*, in the same year; in both these Instruments the See is declared vacant, by the removal of *William Barlow*, *ultimi Episcopi ibidem electi* are the

<sup>c</sup> *Rymer*, Tom. 14. p. 570. See the Records in the Appendix. p. 368

Words of the Instrument : Now, it is asserted, that if *Barlow* had been consecrated in *April 1536*, it is most certain they would not have given him the title of *Episcopi ibidem electi*, it being without president in Instruments of this kind, that Bishops already consecrated should be barely entituled *Elect*; and in short, among all the great number of Instruments of the removals of consecrated Bishops, contain'd in *Rymer's Collection*, none are found conformable to these ; and in all appearance, it would be in vain to seek for them any where else.

I cannot but acknowledge, That the two Records that style *Barlow Episcopi ibidem electi*, with respect to the See of *St. Asaph*, are not so very singular ; tho' a Man ought not to be surpris'd, since it is very rare to see a Bishop translated to another *See*, before he is enthroniz'd in the former ; and that in the space of 200 years, it will be difficult to find above two or three Examples of this kind. But let the case be how it will, it is nevertheless certain, that the term of *Bishop Elect* does not necessarily imply an omission of Consecration. In short, *Champney* himself owns, that a Bishop, tho' he is consecrated, may yet retain the Name of a Bishop *Elect*, until such time as he is inthroniz'd ; that is to say, until he is put into a full possession of all rights, spiritual and temporal, belonging to his Bishoprick. <sup>d</sup> " It cannot, says he, be concluded from hence, because *Parker* is call'd Archbishop *Elect* ; that therefore he was not at that time consecrated, but only that he was not install'd in his Chair, as it is necessary to think of *Barlow* and *Scory*, who are only call'd Bishops *Elect*." *Thomas Ward*, <sup>e</sup> who has also, as well as

<sup>d</sup> Non potest, ex eo quod *Parkerus* dicatur Archiepiscopus electus, colligi illum non fuisse tunc omnino sacratum, sed tantum non fuisse in sua Cathedra inthronizatum, ut de *Scoræo* & *Barroo*, \*qui Episcopi tantum electi dicuntur, necesse est sentire. Vide de *Vocat. Minist.* cap. 14. p. 406. <sup>e</sup> *The Controv. of Ordination*, p. 64.

of the English ORDINATIONS. 75

*Champney*, oppos'd the validity of the *English* Ordinations, makes the same acknowledgment. Now it is certain, that *Barlow* was never inthroniz'd in the Bishoprick of *St. Asaph*, but being translated to the See of *St. Davids*, before that he was install'd in the former; he never bore any other character than Bishop *elect*, from his former See. The true reason also why he was not styled Bishop of *St. Davids*, in the two Records objected, but that of Bishop *elect* of *St. Asaph*, is, because he certainly had been consecrated; and it being necessary to give him a successor in this last See, and not in that of *St. Davids*, and that having never been enthroniz'd, he was oblig'd to carry the Name of Bishop of *St. Asaph*, where they had given him a successor; and he was call'd Bishop *elect* according to the usage of the Realm, he not having been install'd in that See.

To put this matter out of doubt, there is no need but to confirm it by one example, so much the more convincing, as it is taken from a case altogether parallel with that of *Barlow's*. In the year 1633, after the death of *Godwin* Bishop of *Hereford*, *William Juxon* was chosen to succeed him in that See; before he was consecrated and install'd, he was translated to *London*; he was confirm'd in this new See the twenty third of *October* 1633, and consecrated the twenty seventh. *Augustine Lyndsell*, Bishop of *Peterborough*, succeeded him in the See of *Hereford* the seventh of *March* following: The King assented to his Election the twenty first of *March* 163 $\frac{3}{4}$ , and the twenty fourth he was confirm'd by Archbishop *Laud*: Now, in the Instrument, as well of Election as the Confirmation of *Lyndsell*, *Juxon*, who was consecrated, and confirm'd in the Bishoprick of *London*, is all along styl'd Bishop *elect* of *Hereford*, which any body may be satisfied of upon an inspection into *Laud's* Register, and into several Records of the same tenor with it: *Cum sedes Episcopalis Herefordensis tam per*

† Regist. Laud, f. 28. 6.



*mortem naturalem Francisci Godwin nuper Episcopi ibidem, ac per promotionem Reverendi in Christo Patris Willelmi Juxon in Episcopum ibidem Electum ad Episcopatum Londoniensem nuper vacaverit, &c.* What reason have we to conclude from these words, that *Juxon* was not at that time consecrated; the Record of whose Consecration was anterior by four months? And if *Juxon* was call'd *Bishop Elect* of *Hereford* four months after he had been consecrated and install'd Bishop of *London*, How can the title of *Bishop Elect* of *St. Asaph* given to *Barlow*, who besides, in the Record of his translation to *St. Davids*, is always call'd absolutely & *Episcopus Menevensis*, without the addition of the word *electus*? I say, How can the title of *Bishop Elect* of *St. Asaph*, given to *Barlow*, prove that he was not consecrated two months before?

It is therefore false, that it is unprecedented for Bishops formerly consecrated, to be styl'd Bishops *Elect*. And if there be no Record of this kind to be found in *Rymer's* great Collection, it is because such translations as these are very uncommon, and also by reason his Collection does not reach so far as the times of *Juxon*; and perhaps his work being so vastly great, several Records may have escap'd his inquiry. Besides, tho' there be no Record of this kind to be met with, it is nevertheless very false, that Bishops consecrated are never call'd simply Bishops *elect*, since in almost all the Records of investiture publish'd by this Author<sup>b</sup>, the new Bishop after his Consecration is styl'd no other than *electi* & *confirmati*, and nothing of *consecrati*; which proves to a demonstration, that this word *Electus* does not always imply a want of Consecration; we must therefore conclude from hence, that the publick Records prove nothing against *Barlow's* Consecration; and that the obscurity of a single Record, which in some

<sup>a</sup> Reg. *Cranmer*, fo. 205.

<sup>b</sup> *Rymer*, Tom. 14. p. 487. 527. 550. 573. 580. 642. 650. 716. &c.

*of the* English ORDINATIONS. 77

respect is more proper to raise a doubt, concerning his election to an after Bishoprick, than of his Consecration, cannot bear down the weight of so many others that carry their own conviction along with them, and are not capable of any other Interpretation.

Before I finish this Chapter, it is convenient that I should not omit an objection which is brought from a possibility of a collusion, which is suppos'd to have been between *Cranmer* and *Barlow*, who conspired together to omit the Ceremony of his Consecration; these two Prelates having given in to the Presbyterian Sentiments, because they did not acknowledge the necessity of Consecration, or the efficacy of the Sacrament of Order. It is very possible, upon this supposition, that *Cranmer*, who knew *Barlow's* sentiments with respect to the inutility and inefficacy of Ordination, and of his aversion to the Ceremonies of the Pontifical, and that in other things he thought as he did; it is, *say they*, very possible that by concert with *Barlow*, *Cranmer* omitted this Ceremony as superstitious, and that he gave him Letters of Institution and Installation, upon which *Barlow* was put into possession; and in consequence, enjoy'd the title of Bishop, held the rank of a Bishop, receiv'd the investiture, and the honours belonging to it; perform'd the functions, and was translated from one Bishoprick to another, without any Persons taking exception against him, even until the reign of Queen *Mary*, when he was oblig'd to retire. This supposition, which first appears no more than possible, yet with some people it has a great appearance of truth, by reason of the impossibility of finding the Record of his Consecration, which appearance, *say they*, at once renders all the Records alledg'd useless; for without any Consecration he might have acted all that they assert of him.

This conjecture is very fine, and has really all the strength that a conjecture can have; but when all is done, it is no more than a conjecture alledg'd against  
*facts*;

*facts*; and how favourable this supposition may be, in order to induce a Man to insist upon it, I do not find that this omission of the Consecration is possible: For in short, if this affair was to have been acted between *Cranmer* and *Barlow* alone, this conjecture wou'd have some appearance of probability; but Ceremonies of this kind are never perform'd in a clandestine manner. There must be at the least three Bishops by the Statute of 1533. There must be certificates of Consecration, in order to obtain the investiture: If the thing was unknown no body complain'd; and if the thing was known, was there not greater room for a complaint? Besides, in a thing impossible to be conceal'd, would *Cranmer* and *Barlow* be so merrily dispos'd, as by such a conduct, to expose themselves to the penalties of a *Premunire*? It was not above three years before, that the Bishops were oblig'd under the penalties annex'd to that Law, to be consecrated by three Bishops. *Henry the eighth* was very strict in having his new Laws observ'd; and notwithstanding his Schism, he was an enemy to such innovators. Was it an easy thing to impose upon the World in such an affair of so publick a nature, and which the rest of the Bishops were concern'd to detect? Besides, supposing this thing might be conceal'd from the King, was it possible it could be conceal'd from the Church? And, is it possible that there should be not even the least ground for suspicion, much less that it should be so stifled, that we should hear nothing of it?

One considerable Argument which we are furnish'd with of *Barlow's* Consecration is, and which we have already touch'd upon in the preceding Chapter; that in the year 1537, he found some accusers in his own Church, that tax'd him with Heresy, and among other propositions this was laid to his Charge; <sup>i</sup> *If the King, as supreme head of the Church*

<sup>i</sup> *Strype's Memorials*, Vol. 1. *Appendix*, p. 287. and *Collier's Eccles. Hist.* Tom. 2. p. 135.



of England, should chuse, or nominate any learned laick to be a Bishop, that Man without Ordination would be as much a Bishop as himself, or any other Bishop, as he was. Now this proposition, be it never so heretical, does it not evidently prove that he was consecrated? Besides, if he had not been consecrated, those very persons who accus'd him of Heresy for advancing that Ordination was not necessary, would certainly have reproach'd him with his putting himself upon the World as a Bishop, without his ever being consecrated. Nevertheless, one finds no manner of proof of any accusation of this kind; and *Gardiner*, who afterwards caus'd him to be depos'd, treats him without any manner of scruple as Bishop of *St. Davids*, and calls him his Brother, in a Letter which he writ to the Duke of *Somerſet*, which is what he certainly would not have done, if he had not known him to be consecrated. *Fox*, Vol. 2. p. 715.

But let it be granted, that *Cranmer* and *Barlow* were in the Presbyterian sentiments with respect to Episcopacy, it is not to be deny'd, after having perus'd the Answers they gave to the Questions propos'd to them upon this subject; yet these opinions do not at all hinder, but that *Cranmer* should consecrate him and several others; they did not prevent *Barlow* from consecrating *Parker*, and from his assisting at the Consecration of *Buckley*, *Grindal*, *Cox*, *Sandys*, and several others. But why should these things have hinder'd his Consecration? Why, say they, he had an aversion to the Ceremonies of the Pontifical. But a Man who accepts of the Ministerial Function contrary to his Conscience, which he dispens'd with; would such a Man omit a thing which he judg'd necessary, in order to give him a rank in the Church, tho' he did not think it free from Superstition? This is at the same time to make *Barlow* a Man of a tender Conscience, and also a Man destitute of all Religion; which is at once to run into two extreams, tho' he had but one, which was

was to accommodate himself to the times, to his King, to his Interests, and all that by those views which we call prudence, oeconomy and management; not to call it weakness, and wicked cunning.

I know it is odd, that no footsteps of the act of this Consecration can be met with, tho' we meet with other Records of less consequence with regard to *Barlow*, and some which seem to contain somewhat contrary to his Consecration. But how many pieces of Consequences are there lost, whilst others of no use are preserv'd? This collection of *Rymer's* furnishes us with a vast number of examples; one may bring several reasons to lessen the surprise arising from this accident, which is neither rare nor singular; yet in these things a Man can only guess: For when one sees divers omissions of the same kind, it is very probable, without seeking for other reasons, that it is owing to the negligence of Secretaries, or else to the loss of a part of the Registers: For as a learned *English* Man has observ'd, in a Letter to me, from which there are some extracts in the *Appendix*, that all the Commissions granted by the Chapter of *Canterbury*, to empower the Bishops of that Province to be consecrated elsewhere than in the Metropolitan Church of *Canterbury*, are lost from the year 1531, to the year 1541. Now whether this happen'd by some accident, or that the Registers were swallow'd up in that devastation which was made by King *Edward* and Queen *Mary*, of all Memorials which those Princes believ'd they ought to destroy, is uncertain.

But let the thing be how it will, to give some colour to this pretended Collusion, there's a necessity that the thing should be kept very secret; and also, as they pretend, the whole was manag'd between *Cranmer* and *Barlow*, who, by concert, took pains to conceal it. Nevertheless, the Records quoted above to support the Conjecture by *facts*, prove on the contrary, that the omission of Consecration was very publick. Since therefore this Conjecture is contrary to

the *facts*, and that the one destroys what the other establisheth, as I have already shewn; one can see no ground to build this presumption upon; so that it appears demonstratively, that *Barlow's Consecration* is not to be contested.

I proceed now to the last difficulty which *M. l'Abbe Renaudot* has brought against *Barlow's Ordination*, and which he has drawn from *Boner's* threats of excommunication against the Bishop of *Landaff*. But as there is a necessity to consider this in its full extent, it shall be the subject matter of the following Chapter.

## CHAP. V.

*Boner's threat of Excommunication is chimerical; and were it real, it proves nothing against Barlow's Consecration.*

ONE does not easily perceive at first sight, what connexion there is between *Barlow's Consecration*, and the menace of excommunication, sent by *Boner* Bishop of *London*, to *Anthony* Bishop of *Landaff*; and he must have no small share of sagacity who concludes the one from the other. This is nevertheless what *M. l'Abbe Renaudot* has done, when he says that *Boner* having threaten'd *Anthony* Bishop of *Landaff* with excommunication, if he concern'd himself in *Parker's Ordination*, he would not have fail'd to send the same message to *Barlow*, had he been apprisd that it was he who was charg'd to perform that Function, and if he had believ'd him to have been a Bishop.

To establish perfectly the truth of this menace, he must confute what I have said in the *second* Chapter, concerning *Parker's Ordination*, upon the testimony



of *Champney* <sup>k</sup>, where he will find that *Champney* makes the Bishops nominated by *Elizabeth*, to meet at a Tavern in a Place certain at *London*, and where he'll find the Bishop of *Landaff* invited ; that the new Bishops flatter'd themselves that he would have ordain'd them ; that *Boner* Bishop of *London*, being advertised of what was design'd, sent and threaten'd the Bishop of *Landaff* with excommunication, if he proceeded ; that being terrified by this menace, he retired, and refus'd to lay his hands on them. It is this account that is the foundation of this objection. For, as it is observ'd, if *Barlow* was himself a Bishop, and acknowledg'd as such, why did not *Boner* threaten him with excommunication, as well as the Bishop of *Landaff*.

But in order to give some authority to this reasoning, the truth of the *fact* it self must be first establish'd, and afterwards the consequences necessary may be drawn from it ; and neither the one or the other is to be seen, since the *fact* it self is encounter'd by all the Laws of Criticism, which strongly oppose the very appearance of truth in it ; and yet, if it were certain, it proves nothing at all against *Barlow's* Consecration.

1. I say, that the *fact*, when judg'd of by all the Laws of Criticism, is false, which is a thing not difficult to be prov'd ; for one may see abundantly at full length in the second Chapter, that the whole relation of *Neal*, upon which this *fact* is built, is a collection of Fables altogether whimsical in every part, contradicted by all the publick Records, and in part

<sup>k</sup> Illuc enim invitatus venit Landavenfis Episcopus, multae senectute jam decrepitu, vir simplex & meticulosus. Ab ipso expectabant Ordinationem novi Candidati. Quod Bonerus Episcopus Londinensis, in carcere religionis ergo constitutus, sub olfaciens, minatus est Landavenfi excommunicationem, si eum ordinaret : quo nuntio territus, & tactus etiam fortassis intrinsecus conscientiae stimulis, ille pedem retulit, & oculorum infirmitatem causatus manus eis imponere recusavit. Vide *Champney* de vocatione Ministr. cap. 14. p. 497.

of the English ORDINATIONS. 83

particular by all the Royal Commissions issu'd out for the Ordination of the new Bishops ; by the Record of Parker's Consecration ; by the Registers of *Canterbury*, and that of other Churches ; and in short, by all the most authentick Registers and Records which are found at the Rolls. But this relation appear'd in so bad a light to M. *Renaudot*, that whatever Interest he had to make it of weight, in order to destroy Parker's Ordination, yet he did not think it convenient to insist upon it, contenting himself with saying, *That the Protestants defended themselves very ill from the reproaches against them about that time, or soon afterwards ; as if it had been true, that this reproach had been made at the time of the Ordination, or that it was defending themselves weakly, to produce the very Record of Ordination, taken out of the publick Registers to confute the calumny.*

But not to repeat here all that I have already urg'd to destroy the truth of this relation, it is certain that the particular *fact* of threatening an excommunication, has in it self no appearance of truth, it being improbable that it should hinder the Bishop of *Landaff* from engaging himself in this affair : For, in short, who was it that threaten'd this excommunication ? Why truly it was a Bishop, whom the Bishop of *Landaff* himself, as well as other Bishops, look'd upon as depos'd, and consequently as one that had no jurisdiction ; a Bishop, who, tho' he were not depos'd, yet in this thing was irregular, for he had no jurisdiction over the Person to whom he sent this pretended menace ; a Bishop, who had no manner of right to hinder the performance of an Office in a Church not within his jurisdiction, where it could be perform'd in defiance of him : Since there are so many Churches in *London* subject immediately to the Metropolitan, *Soli Archiepiscopo subjiuntur*<sup>1</sup>, as the Author of the *Antiquity of the British Church* observes, who sets down a list of them, and in particular, that

<sup>1</sup> De Antiq. Britan. Eccl. p. 33.

84 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

of *St. Mary le Bow in Cheapside*, where *Parker* was confirm'd ; which is under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of *Canterbury*.

Besides, this threat of an excommunication does not agree with the Record of *Parker's* Consecration : For, according to that, his Ordination was perform'd in the Palace of *Lambeth*. Now the Palace of *Lambeth* is intirely in the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, as the same Author observes, " <sup>m</sup> The manner and custom of the Archbishops of *Canterbury* anciently was, and is so still, that in their own Estates, where ever they are in *England*, no other Bishops besides themselves have any right, but all jurisdictions divine and human are in their disposal, as if in their proper Diocess." Therefore nothing was to be fear'd from *Boner* Bishop of *London*. The Diocess which *Lambeth* is in, is not the same ; for as an *English* Man, not long since, writes to one of my Friends, " <sup>n</sup> The Palace of *Lambeth* is situated in the County of *Surry*, and consequently in the Diocess of *Winchester*, and not in that of *London*, but yet it is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Winchester*. Every Palace wherein a Bishop resides out of his Diocess, in what place soever situated, is of foreign jurisdiction, and is what we style in our Law, a Peculiar. The Bishop of *Ely* has a Palace at *London* exempted from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of *London*, and he acts within that Palace the same as if he were in his own Diocess. This is also what the Archbishop of *Canterbury* does at *Lambeth*, where almost all the Bishops of his Province are consecrated, and that without even asking the leave of the Bishop of *Winchester*, it being exempted from his jurisdiction. To what end then serves *Boner's* threatning ? He neither had power over

<sup>m</sup> Mos & consuetudo Archiepiscoporum Cantuariensium antiquo fuit, & est, ut in terris suis ubicumque per Angliam singulis nullus Episcoporum præter se jus aliquod habeat, sed humana simul, & divina omnia velut in propria Diocesi in sua dispositione consistant. Antiquit. Eccl. Brit. ibid. ut supra. <sup>n</sup> A Letter from Mr. Daniel Pultney, dat. the 27<sup>th</sup> of March, 1721.



of the English ORDINATIONS. 85

the Bishop of *Landaff*, nor over the place where the Ordination was to be perform'd. That Censure therefore could not hinder the performance of that Office, and it would be to shoot a Bolt to no purpose, and without any the least prospect of preventing what *Boner* is said to have oppos'd.

This pretended menace does also little agree with it self : For according to *Champney*, the new Bishops would not have made choice of a Tavern to be ordain'd in, if they had not apprehended something of an excommunication, wherewith they were threatned if it were perform'd in a Church. ° “ When they had, “ says he, no hopes to bring the Bishop of *Landaff* to “ their Churches, from whom they both desired “ and expected to receive Consecration, they chose “ such a Place to perform it in, to which he would “ not scruple to come ; therefore it was determin'd “ that they should meet at the *Nagshhead* by appoint- “ ment”. Therefore to send the message of excommunicating to the Tavern was to no purpose, for they believ'd it a sufficient covert by avoiding to perform their Ceremony in a Church.

If one should answer that if those who were to be consecrated, did not much regard excommunication, yet the Bishop of *Landaff* might be afraid of it. This is assuredly what is impossible to prove, because at the bottom, the Bishop of *Landaff* always inwardly adher'd to the Catholick Doctrine, *Pontificiæ doctrinæ ad- dictissimus*, <sup>p</sup> says *Godwin* : And should he much fear an excommunication, to which he was already subject, by taking the Oath of Supremacy, and recognising, as he had done, the Queen for chief of the Church of *England* ?

° Cum nulla esset illis spes Episcopum Landavensem, à quo consecrationem recipere & cupiebant & expectabant, ad Ecclesias suas adducendi, talem locum ad id efficiendum elegerunt, ad quem ipse accedere non hæsitaret, indeque factum est ut Caput Manni ex conducto convenirent. *Champ. de Vocat. Minist. p.*

In fine, I agree that the Bishop of *Landaff* was nominated in both the Queen's Commissions, to be one of *Parker's* consecrators, but either refus'd, or endeavour'd to elude the performance of an office he did not like, he observing at the same time, that all the Catholick Bishops were resolv'd to have nothing to do in that affair; but I cannot perceive that it was the fear of an excommunication which was the cause of that refusal. Perhaps it is not ill grounded to say that this Prelate, who, according to *Godwin* was at the bottom a Catholick, notwithstanding the differing parts he acted in the Commotions that disturb'd that Church, and which he expected every day would take a new turn, was not inclin'd to be concern'd in an Ordination, wherein he believ'd all the ancient rules were violated, and wherein he would be instrumental in reviving the Ordinal of *Edward the sixth*, which was abolish'd in the reign of Queen *Mary*. Thus without refusing directly to assist at these Ordinations, he took the advantage of the slightest pretences in order to be dispens'd with, and left that to be perform'd by others which he reputed to be odious and unbecoming for one in his circumstances to do: This is what appears to have been the mystery of the Bishop of *Landaff's* non compliance; and his after conduct, as well as the consequences of it, administers sufficient grounds to adhere to this conjecture. For one may perceive that he sometimes sided with one party, and sometimes with the other, and that the fear of an excommunication never hinder'd him from adhering to the strongest side.

2. But suppose that this menace of an excommunication, against the Bishop of *Landaff*, was as true as some would have it imagin'd to be; yet the consequence is very false to conclude from hence that *Bairlow* was never consecrated, because *Boner* did not threaten him as he did the other: For in short, their cases were very different. <sup>1</sup> *Anthony* Bishop of *Land*

<sup>1</sup> Sanderus de Schif. Angl. lib. 2. p. 307.

*Landaff*, by his reconciliation with *Rome*, in the reign of *Queen Mary*, was re-enter'd into the Catholick Communion, from which he never afterwards separated. *Boner* therefore might threaten an excommunication if he acted a part in an Ordination which he regarded as sacrilegious. There might be some room for such a menace in the circumstances which we shall presume: For suppose that *Boner* acted in the Name of the Pope, or suppose that as Bishop of *London*, he forbid the performance of an Ordination, under the pain of ecclesiastical Censures, in a place within his jurisdiction; in both these cases there may be room to believe, that the Bishop of *Landaff*, who had not again openly turn'd Schismatick, might submit to the menaces which were made against him, because of the regard he paid the to ecclesiastical Censures.

But what signified such threatnings against *Barlow*, who had long since separated himself from the Church of *Rome*, and was never reconcil'd to her; he was excommunicated along with the rest of the adherers to the Schism, and consequently it was to no purpose to threaten him with a new excommunication, which he valu'd not, and which did not hinder him from going further? This disparity is very evident between *Barlow* and the Bishop of *Landaff*, and it is surprizing that *M. l'Abbe Renaudot* did not perceive it, or having discover'd it, that he did not at the same time see that his reasoning was ill-grounded.

Moreover, it does not appear that *Boner* threaten'd with excommunication any of the other Bishops who were *Parker's* Consecrators together with *Barlow*; neither *Scory*, nor *Coverdale*, nor *Hodgskins*, receiv'd any message of this kind from *Boner*; his duty was no more to spare them than the Bishop of *Landaff*, since it is the same thing to assist as to be the principal Consecrator. Nevertheless *Boner*, not having threaten'd the other three, must one conclude from this silence, that these three consecrating Bishops were ne-



# 88 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

ver consecrated Bishops, because the menace did not extend itself to them? It may be so said of *Scory* and *Coverdale*, because their Ordination was perform'd by King *Edward's* new Ordinal. The same reason does not hold good as to *Hodgskins* consecrated in 1537, in the reign of *Henry* the eighth, and consequently with all the requisite formalities, and all the ceremonies prescribed by the *Roman Pontifical*.

But what is most remarkable in this thing is, that the excommunication is of no force but upon the supposition of the truth of *Champney's* relation. Now supposing this, *Barlow* was not affected by it, for according to that account, it was not *Barlow* but *Scory* that officiated upon that occasion. \* "Being disappointed of a Consecrator, saith *Champney*, they were forced to take new measures, and they had recourse to *Scory* an apostate Monk, who, in the time of *Edward* the sixth, intruded into a Bishoprick, in order to be ordain'd by him: He, who together with his religious habit quitted his conscience, soon performed the thing, using this ceremony; They all kneeled before him, and putting the Bible upon the head of each of them, saying, *Receive power to preach the word of God sincerely*; and thus they all rose up Bishops." There is no other Bishop mention'd here but *Scory*, and there is no notice taken of *Barlow*; the menace therefore said to be made by *Boner* was to no purpose, since according to this account *Barlow* had nothing to do with this Ordination, and consequently nothing can be concluded contrary to his consecration from a threat which did not relate to it by all the rules of judging.

Now either the relation of *Champney* is true, or else it is false; if it be true, it doth not follow from thence, that because he threaten'd to excommunicate the Bishop of *Landaff*, that he also would have threaten'd *Barlow* in case he had been a true Bishop; for he had

\* *Champ. de Vocat. Minist. cap. 14. p. 498.*

nothing to do in the affair upon the refusal of the Bishop of *Landaff*, for it was *Scory* alone, as the account informs us. If on the contrary the relation be false and unsustainable, as I have proved it is, what use was there for a threat that had no reality, and which could be of no more authority than the fabulous relation upon which it is founded?

Nothing therefore can be more false or feeble to destroy the Consecration of *Barlow*, than the argument drawn from this threat of an excommunication. Nothing is more false, because it is built upon a fabulous relation that is contradictory in itself, and is also destroy'd by all the publick authentick Records. But at the same time nothing is more weak, since if we presume that the threatening of the Bishop of *Landaff* be true, it is impossible to conclude any thing from it against the Consecration of *Barlow*, consider it either with regard to the relation, or to the Record, of *Parker's* Ordination.

---

## CHAP. VI.

*There was no essential Defect, either as to the matter or form in the Consecration of Archbishop Parker.*

I Have already in the second Chapter given an historical account of *Parker's* Ordination, and the instrument itself shall be inserted among the collections placed at the end of this treatise. I shall annex likewise the forms of Ordination, transcribed from the Liturgy of King *Edward* the *sixth*, that every body may be enabled from the instruments themselves to judge of the truth of what is advanced in this Chapter.

But before I enter on the subject, it will be necessary first to lay down certain maxims, that may serve

as

as so many principles in the determination of this point. Now to judge with certainty whether there was no essential defect in *Parker's* Consecration, it is absolutely necessary to enquire what is essential in Ordination, with regard both to the matter and the form; an enquiry which will be cleared up in a few words.

To begin with what relates to the matter of Ordination; this is a point which cannot admit of a long debate, since the learned work of *Morinus* upon the sacrament of Orders; for the proofs which he has there produced, have appeared so convincing to all learned divines, that they agree unanimously with him in opinion, that *the imposition of hands is the only essential matter of this Sacrament*. "Therefore, says this<sup>r</sup> learned writer speaking of the School-divines, being forced to it at last, they had recourse to the imposition of hands, which *alone* has the warrant of all the Fathers, and all the ancient Rituals, both *Greek* and *Latin*, in its favour." Indeed tho' the Schoolmen of late years would fain have either the unction or the imposition of the book of the Gospels, or even the delivery of some instruments suitable to the order and dignity conferred, (as *Durandus*<sup>s</sup> Bishop of *Mende* thought) to be looked upon as *essential* parts of the matter of this sacrament, yet all these opinions are rejected now as unable to be maintained, since it is not only easy to shew that the usage of these things hath neither been perpetual nor universal in the church, but the scripture does not so much as mention any of them, but speaks *only* of imposition of hands.

Besides this silence of the scripture as to all these points, it is well known that the *unction* is not at this day, and never was in use among the *Greeks*; that before the ninth century, there is scarce any footsteps to be met with of the delivery of the instruments, in

<sup>r</sup> Morin. de Sac. Ordin. p. 3. exercit. 2. cap. 1. p. 19.

<sup>s</sup> Ration. lib. 2. cap. ult.



## of the English ORDINATIONS. 91

the Rituals publish'd by those eminent divines <sup>r</sup> *Morinus*, <sup>v</sup> *Mabillon*, and <sup>x</sup> *Martene*; and that with regard to the imposition of the book of the Gospels, though the use of it is both more antient and more universal than that of the unction, or the instruments, yet there is no mention made of it at all, in the rites of the Ordinations of the *Syrians* and *Maronites*, publish'd by *Morinus* <sup>y</sup>; nor in the eighth or ninth *Ordo Romanus* given us by father *Mabillon* <sup>z</sup>; and it appears from *Alcuin* and *Amalarius*, that the church of *Rome* itself did not always make use of this ceremony. <sup>a</sup> "There is  
" no authority to be produced for it either antient or  
" new; nay, not so much as the tradition of the par-  
" ticular church of *Rome*."

I do not set myself here to enlarge upon these facts, I take them for granted; but if any body hath a mind to dispute them, let him consult the proofs produced of them in the learned work of *Morinus*, and the collections of *Mabillon* and *Martene*. Now supposing 'em to be true, it follows thence by necessary consequence, *That the imposition of hands is the only essential matter of episcopal Ordination*; that all the other usages are but mere ceremonies, proper either to represent the effects of the sacrament, or to point out the obligations of it in a more distinct and particular manner; that consequently they may be omitted without affecting the substance of the sacrament; that every church may add to 'em, or retrench from 'em any thing that it shall judge proper for publick instruction and edification, without danger of giving scandal to any body. "It  
" gives us no scandal [(says \* *Fulbertus Carnot.* ep. 2.) to  
" hear that there have always been different usages and  
" customs, but the same common faith in the churches of  
" Christ;" and that we ought not to judge of

<sup>r</sup> Morin. de Sacr. Ordin. p. 2.      <sup>v</sup> Mabillon Mus. Ital. t. 2.  
<sup>x</sup> Martene de Rit. Eccl. t. 2.      <sup>y</sup> Morin. part 2.      <sup>z</sup> Mut.  
Ital. tom. 2.      <sup>a</sup> Alcuin de Div. Offic.      \* Neque in hoc  
scandalizamus, si audimus diversam observationem, sed non di-  
versam fidem in Christi semper Ecclesiis extitisse.

the validity or invalidity of Ordinations by the use or omission of these ceremonies.

Whether the facts drawn from the authorities produced by the authors above quoted, or any other reasons still more forcible, have made an impression upon Monsieur *L'Abbe Renaudot*, he seems to agree with me in this point, since he does not think there was any essential defect in *Parker's* Ordination with regard to the *matter*, and insists only on the defects of “ the *form*, which, he says, the whole church was a “ stranger to, and that no traces were to be found of “ it in all the Pontificals of the christian world.”

Now to make a judicious determination of this question, it is necessary to examine wherein the essence of this *form* particularly consists, whether in a certain form of words, as *Receive thou the Holy Ghost, &c.* or in certain stated prayers used uniformly in all churches; or else in prayers in general, such as every church shall think fit to make choice of, and use together with *imposition of hands*, which all the world agrees is the *matter* of Ordination.

The Schoolmen have maintained that these words, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost, &c.* were the *form* of Ordination; but how generally soever this opinion has prevail'd, it is very difficult to stand out against the reasons which *Morinus* and *Martene* bring to refute it; the most convincing of which, are that these words were never at all in use among the eastern Christians, and the use of them in the Latin church is of a very late date. “ There are no Latin Rituals of any antiquity “ (says <sup>b</sup> *Morinus*) to be met with, that have these “ words in them, nor is there any mention made of “ them even in many of much later times. It is

<sup>b</sup> Nulli rituales antiqui hæc habent verba, nusquam comparent; etiam in recentioribus multis nulla eorum mentio. Apud Latinos cœpta sunt usurpari vix ab annis quadringentis; apud Græcos autem & Syros, nec est nec unquam fuit illorum usus: Itaque nullâ ratione dici possunt ad Ordinis substantiam pertinere. *Morin. de Sacr. Ordin. part. 3. exercit. 2. cap. 2. p. 22.*

of the English ORDINATIONS. 93

“ scarce four hundred years ago since they began to  
“ be used among the *Latins* ; but as for the *Greeks* and  
“ *Syrians*, they neither do at present, nor ever did  
“ make use of them ; so that there is no reason for  
“ making them of the substance of Ordination.” *Martene* has the same sentiments upon this subject as the learned *Morinus*. “ Those words (says <sup>c</sup> he) *receive thou the Holy Ghost* ; which before the said preface are spoke by the Consecrator himself when he is laying on his hands, and in which the Schoolmen of later times place the form of episcopal Ordination, were unknown to all antiquity, so that they are scarce to be met with in any Pontifical that is four hundred years old.” These assertions are supported by all manner of proofs that can be desired in a case of this nature, for of all the Oriental and Latin Rituals publish’d by *Morinus*, *Mabillon*, and *Martene*, there are not above two or three, and those modern enough, in which these words are contain’d ; so that there is no pronouncing of the validity or defect of the *English* Ordinations on account of any change made in this form of words, since the form itself never was used in Ordination for more than a thousand years.

Nor is it any ways more difficult to shew that the essence of the *form* of Ordination is not annexed to any stated, fixed, and uniform prayers in all churches. The bare looking into the antient Pontificals and Rituals of different churches demonstrates it <sup>d</sup>. The prayers contained in the Greek Rituals, are different from those we see in the Oriental and Latin Rituals ; and even among the Latin ones, though a greater uniformity be observed in them, yet there are diffe-

<sup>c</sup> Verba illa, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, quæ ante prædictam præfationem cum manûs impositione ab ipso consecratore proferruntur, in quibus formam Episcopatus reponunt scholastici recentiores, toti antiquitati ignota fuerunt ; adeo ut vix in ullo Pontificali annos quadringentos attingente reperiantur. De Ant. Eccl. Ritibus, lib. 1. cap. 8. Art. 10. p. 330. <sup>d</sup> Morin. de Sacr. Ordin. part 2.



rences enough to be found to warrant this conclusion, that though they were all directed to the same end, yet every church had the liberty of determining itself as to the particular form of words it would use preferably to any other; and it may be said of Ordination in particular, what *Fulbert of Chartres* says of all parts of the Liturgy in general. <sup>c</sup> “In many particulars (says he) *Greece* and *Spain* differ, the churches also of *Rome* and *France* differ from them, yet we receive no scandal from *thence*.” There is not therefore any proof to warrant an inference, that the prayer made use of in the *Roman Pontifical* is more essential than any other, provided it be the same in substance, *i. e.* that it contains an invocation of the Holy Ghost for supplying the Bishop elect with all the graces necessary for a worthy discharge of the duties of his office, whatever difference there be in other respects, either as to the choice, disposition, and order of the words, or in the words themselves.

We may say therefore that in general the invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the Bishop elect, makes the form of Ordination, and does jointly with the imposition which accompanies it of course, constitute properly what we call the sacrament of Ordination. This is a natural consequence from the foregoing propositions; for if the form of Ordination consists neither in these words, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost*; nor in any stated and uniform prayers of all churches, for they have still varied according to times and places; nor in those forms of words which are used at the unction or with the other ceremonies, which cannot upon account of their novelty be look'd upon as the *matter*, there is nothing left for us to affix the notion of the *form* to, but *prayer* in general: And this indeed is the opinion that the most able of our modern divines run into, all of them maintaining positively that, exclusive

<sup>c</sup> Fulbert. Carnot. ep. 2. In multis Græcia & Hispania, ab illis Romana & Gallica discrepat Ecclesia, sed neque in hoc scandalizamus.

of every thing else, *the imposition of hands*, and *prayer*, make the *matter* and *form* of Ordination, and that consequently every thing else that is used therein, does not concern the substance of the sacrament.

This opinion is now generally agreed in, and the council of *Trent* declares expressly, That the church may meddle with what does not enter into the substance of the sacraments. <sup>f</sup> “ The holy synod declares “ that the church always had a power of making “ such constitutions and alterations, in the dispensa- “ tion of the sacraments, provided their substance “ was preserved, as it should judge, with regard to “ the variety of circumstances, times, and places, to “ be most expedient for the salvation of the receivers, “ or the veneration of the sacraments *themselves*.” ’Tis likewise a received principle among Divines, that in cases where the Faith itself, or the substance of the sacraments are not concerned, every particular church may draw up its own rites, liturgy, and prayers, as shall be shewn fully in another chapter.

In order therefore to prove the Ordinations of the *English* Bishops to be valid, all that is wanting is to shew that there was no essential defect in *Parker’s* Consecration, and that the alterations made in the form of Ordination, do not affect its substance. This I shall easily do by an argument which will evidently demonstrate the truth of the proposition I have advanced, and yet is no more than a necessary consequence of the observations made just before.

*Imposition of hands* and *prayer* in general; that is to say, the invocation of the Holy Ghost to supply the Bishop elect with all the graces necessary for his worthy discharge of the functions of his ministry, are of themselves alone *the matter* and *essential form* of the sa-

<sup>f</sup> Declarat [sancta synodus] hanc potestatem perpetuo in ecclesia fuisse, ut in sacramentorum dispensatione, salva illorum substantia, ea statueret vel mutaret, quæ suscipientium salutem, seu ipsorum sacramentorum venerationem, pro rerum, temporum & locorum varietate, magis expedire judicaverit. Sess. 21. cap. 2.

crament of orders. This appears evidently from the Rituals and Pontificals, both *Greek* and *Latin*, which antiquity hath transmitted down to us, and from the testimonies of the antients, who confirm the observations we make from such liturgical monuments as are extant. I shall not lose time here in quoting these proofs, because all the world has it in their power to consult them, and they would only serve to swell this treatise to no purpose. Now the *English* in their new form of Ordination, retain'd both *imposition* of hands and *prayer*, so that there could be no essential defect either as to the matter or form in the Ordination of *Parker*.

As there is no difficulty in relation to the first proposition, and all learned Divines do now agree unanimously in that point, all that remains to be done, is to give a satisfactory proof of the second, which must be taken from the new Ordinal and the Laws which enjoin the use of it. This Ordinal was published in the reign of *Edward* the *sixth*, and being re-established afterwards by *Queen Elizabeth*, continu'd in use from thence to *Cromwell's* time. Then after a short intermission, it was upon *King Charles* the *second's* restoration re-establish'd, with some alterations, of which I shall speak afterwards, and was so publish'd in 1662. Now in this Ordinal, both as it was publish'd at first under *Edward* the *sixth*, and as it was alter'd afterwards under *Charles* the *second*, we find the use both of imposition of hands, and of prayer, or the invocation of the Holy Ghost for supplying the Bishop elect with all the graces and assistances needful for him. This is demonstrable from the reading of that Ordinal, which shall be publish'd among the proofs inserted at the end of this treatise, and from which I shall only make some extracts at present.

As to imposition of hands, it is evidently prescribed by *King Edward's* Ordinal; for the Rubrick says expressly, *Then tharchebishop and Bishoppes present shall laye their handes upon the hed of the elect Bishop,*  
tharchbishop



archbishop sayng, *Take the Holy Ghost, &c.* Nor is the Rubrick of King *Charles the second's* Ordinal less expresse, for it runs in these terms, "Then the Archbishop and Bishops present shall lay their hands upon the head of the elected Bishop, kneeling before them upon his knees, the Archbishop saying, *Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.*" The terms made use of here, are too expresse to be liable to any cavil. The Records likewise that are still preserved of the *English* Consecrations, are a further confirmation of this proof, as attesting the exact observance and constant usage of this ceremony. Thus in the second volume of the *History of the Reformation*<sup>f</sup>, we find in the instrument of *Parker's* Consecration these very words: "After offering up several prayers and supplications to God, according to the form prescrib'd in the book of Common-prayer established by act of parliament, the Bishops of *Chichester* and *Hereford*, the Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford*, and *Miles Coverdale*, laid their hands upon the Archbishop, and said in *English*, *Take the Holy Ghost, &c.*"

'Tis true indeed that in this Record there is no mention made, either of the unction, or of the delivery of certain instruments, or of the laying of the book of the 8 Gospels upon the head or shoulders of the person consecrated; but (as we have seen already, and learned Men have proved to a demonstration) these things do not concern the essence of Ordination, and have not been observ'd in all times, nor are observed in all places. The most universal and most ancient of any of the ceremonies omitted, is the laying on of the book of the Gospels; and this was retain'd in a manner that is at least equivalent, in the new form of Ordination; where, after the imposition of hands, we find this Rubrick, "Then the Archbishop

<sup>f</sup> Burnet's *Hist. Reform.* part 2. Append. p. 164.      <sup>g</sup> In the first Ordinal of Edward VI. *Then the Archbishop shall lay the Bible upon his Necke, sayng, Geve hede unto readyng, &c.*

“ taking the book of the Gospels, and delivering it  
 “ to him, shall say these words, *Give heed unto read-*  
 “ *ing, &c.*” Now this ceremony making no part of the  
 matter, and no way concerning the essence of the sa-  
 crament, it is perfectly indifferent whether they put  
 the book of the Gospels upon the head or shoulders,  
 or into the hands of the person, especially since the  
 ceremony is merely figurative, and has been different-  
 ly practised in christian churches, as *Morinus* has ob-  
 served, who concludes that it cannot be a part of the  
 matter of Ordination. “ This variety <sup>h</sup>, says that learn-  
 “ ed writer, shews us as in a glass, what little stress  
 “ is to be laid upon those arguments which many are  
 “ influenced by, in asserting or denying the imposi-  
 “ tion of the book of the Gospels to belong to the  
 “ matter of episcopal Ordination.” This he had alrea-  
 dy proved by reasons drawn from tradition. “ For be-  
 “ ing my self <sup>i</sup>, says he, determined by other reasons,  
 “ by reasons derived from ecclesiastical tradition, I  
 “ conclude that the imposition of the Gospels upon  
 “ the neck and shoulders of the Person ordained, no  
 “ ways affects the substance of episcopal Ordination.”  
 These reasons indeed have appeared so convincing to  
 the learned world, that there has scarce been any  
 dispute in the Schools upon this subject, since the pub-  
 lishing of his work.

This is so very clear and exprefs, that *Abbe Renaudot*  
 hath not thought fit to attack the validity of the *Eng-*  
*lish* Ordinations in this particular, but founds his  
 charge against them entirely on the alterations made  
 in the form. This must therefore be examined : And

<sup>h</sup> Hæc varietas, velut in speculo demonstrat quàm caduca  
 sint & fragilia argumenta, quibus plerique freti, asserunt vel ne-  
 gant codicis evangelici impositionem ad episcopatus materiam  
 pertinere. De Sacr. Ordin. part 3. exercit. 2. cap. 1. p. 21.

<sup>i</sup> Ib. p. 20.—Aliis tamen rationibus fretus, ex traditione sci-  
 licet ecclesiasticâ petitis, colligo illam evangelii super cervicem  
 & scapulas ordinandi impositionem ad episcopatus substantiam  
 non pertinere.

fanſy I ſhall prove in the cleareſt manner, that the alterations therein made, make no alteration at all in the ſubſtance of it. M. *Abbe Renaudot* poſitively maintains the contrary, urging that a form unknown to the whole Latin church, as well antient as modern, and entirely different from the Pontificals of all chriſtian nations, cannot be looked upon as a juſt and valid form; and the rather, becauſe this very form ſuits as well to the ordination of Priests, as it does to that of Biſhops.

But I would willingly ask of that writer, what he means by a *form unknown to the whole church*? For if by an unknown form, he means a form of Ordination, in which no prayer is uſed, nor any invocation of the Holy Ghoſt upon the Biſhop elect; I agree with him that ſuch a form is unlawful and invalid, becauſe the very ſubſtance of ſuch a form is entirely altered and deſtroy'd: But in this ſenſe it is not true, that the form of the *English* Ordinations is unknown to the whole church; becauſe both prayer and the invocation of the Holy Ghoſt, are contained in the *English* Ordinal. But if by an unknown form, he means only a form of prayer differing indeed from the *Roman* Pontifical, yet retaining the ſubſtance of it, 'tis true in this ſenſe, that the form of the *English* Ordinations is unknown to the Latin church; but withal there is nothing more falſe than to aſſert that a form unknown in this ſenſe, is on that account unlawful and invalid.

For to ſupport ſuch an aſſertion, we muſt take for granted, what has been already refuted, *viz.* that the form of Ordination is annexed to certain ſtated and uniform prayers in all churches. Now this is evidently falſe, and is refuted by the bare reading of the antient Pontificals of different churches, and by comparing (which is eaſily done) the Greek and Oriental rituals with thoſe of the *Latins*. For, granting this ſuppoſition, how can we maintain the validity of the Greek and Oriental Ordinations, their forms being



all different from ours? Or if those of the *Greeks* are good, how can we maintain the validity of those of the *Latins*? For if it be true that the validity of Ordination is annexed to a fixed form and an uniform prayer, either the *Greeks* or the *Latins* must necessarily want a true and valid Ordination; and in this case, where shall we assign the preference of one church before the other, and what proofs will it be possible to bring, that the prayers of the *Latin* church, *e. g.* are rather the true form of Ordination, than the prayers which the *Greeks* and eastern Christians use?

This reason is so conclusive, that no body now disputes the validity of the Ordinations of the *Greeks*; and yet, if their Ordinations are valid, tho' the prayer they make use of be different from that of the *Latins*, how can we deny the church of *England* the power to make use of a particular form of prayers of her own, when we allow this very right to the churches of the East? Is the independence which the East affects with regard to the church of *Rome*, pleaded in behalf of so unequal a conduct? Surely an independence, which *Rome* considers as criminal, can never give a right to a thing for which they have no other title to plead. Is the reason then that the church of *England* hath long ago adopted the usage and form made use of by the church of *Rome*? What if the *English* did freely submit to the use of the *Roman* Pontifical; yet this carries with it no prescription against the liberty they enjoy of making what alterations in it they think necessary for the discipline of their church; and if they had once the liberty of receiving it, they have still that of rejecting or reforming it. Now we shall see a little lower that *England* was entirely at her liberty, when she adopted the particular Ritual of the church of *Rome*, and that *Rome* has no right to oblige other churches to submit to her particular discipline, as St. *Gregory* the Great acknowledges with regard to the church of *England* in particular. Should it be urged in fine, that the form which the *English* have substituted

*of the* English ORDINATIONS. 101

substituted instead of that of the *Roman* Pontifical, does not contain every thing that is essential to the form of Ordination; 'tis easy by comparing the forms and prayers of the *Roman* Pontifical and King *Edward's* Ordinal, to shew that the form of the Church of *England* hath made no alteration at all in the substance of the true form of Ordination.

The essence of that form of Prayer, as hath been already observ'd, consists in the invocation of the Holy Ghost to supply the Bishop elect with all the Graces necessary for the due discharge of his Ministry. Now the full meaning of this Prayer is preserv'd in the *English* Ordinal, which begins in these terms, Almighty God, geber of all good thinges, whiche by thy Holy Spirit hast appointed diverse Orders of Ministers in thy Church, mercifully beholde thys thy seruant nowe called to the worke and ministry of a Bishop, and replenish him so with the truthe of thy Doctrine and innocencie of life, that both by worde and dede he maie faithfully serbe the in thys office, &c. What do they ask for more in the Prayers of the Pontifical? They enlarge indeed a little more particularly on the duties of the Bishop; they mention the power of the Keys, and the authority committed to him, and speak of the unction as well as the instruments with which he is invested, so as to draw several proper instructions thence. Now as the unction, and the most part of the episcopal Ornaments have been laid aside, they being in truth no way essential to Ordination, it is not at all surprising that they should likewise omit the last part of the long Prayer, which is said by way of preface in the Pontifical: But as for what relates to the power of the Keys, and the authority committed to the Bishop, they have taken care not to forget it in the *English* Ordinal. Thus in the Prayer immediately preceding the imposition of hands, we read these Words, Graunt, wee beseeche thee, to this thy seruant suche Grace, that he maie be evermore ready to spreade abroad thy Gospell, and the glad tidenges

tidyngeſ of reconcilment to God, and to uſe the authoritie geven unto him, not to deſtroie but to ſave; not to hurt but to helpe, &c. Theſe Words are plainly agreeable to the following Paſſage of the Pontifical; " Give him, O Lord, the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, that he may make uſe of, and " not glory in the power which thou givest him " for edification, and not for deſtruction, &c." To the ſame Effect the Queſtion is put to the Biſhop elect, whether he will ſuppreſs diſorders, and exert the authority given him by the Word of God; Suche as be unquiet, diſobedient, and criminouſe within your Diocēſ, [will you] correct and puniſhe, according to ſuche Authoritie as ye have by Goddes Worde, and as to you ſhall be committed by Ordinance of this Realme: This muſt neceſſarily be underſtood of the Keys, which comprehends all the authority, which the Church intruſts in the hands of the Biſhop, for the edification of the faithful.

Hitherto it appears no eaſy matter to point out a defect in the form of Ordination preſcrib'd by King Edward's Ordinal. But further, after ſinging the Litaney in the *Roman Pontifical*, the Biſhops who are the conſecrators, lay their hands on the head of the Biſhop elect, ſaying theſe Words, *Receive thou the Holy Ghoſt*. Now this very form, which may be conſider'd as a ſecond invocation of the Holy Ghoſt, tho' it be pronounc'd in an imperative manner, is uſ'd in King Edward's Ordinal, as well as the *Roman Pontifical*: For after the Hymn, *Veni Creator*, and the Prayer that follows it, the Biſhops, who are the conſecrators, lay their hands on the head of the new Biſhop, and the Archbiſhop ſays theſe Words, *Take the Holy Ghoſt*, &c. Here is exactly the very ſame uſage on both ſides; and if it be granted that the omiſſion of the Prayers, appointed to be uſ'd at the unction, or delivery of the inſtruments, does not affect the ſubſtance of the Ordination, (as hath been already



already demonstrated) I do not see any thing more that can be charg'd as defective in the form prescrib'd by King *Edward's* Ordinal.

For one of these three must be the case. The essence of the form of Ordination must be annex'd, either to the substance of the Prayers, which accompany the imposition of hands, or to the grammatical Words of the *Roman Pontifical*, or lastly, to the other Prayers that are us'd with the Ceremonies of unction and the instruments: It cannot be annex'd to these two last, because the Ceremonies themselves not being at all essential, the Prayers accompanying and relating to them cannot be of a different nature; nor can it be annex'd to the grammatical Words of the *Roman Pontifical*, which are not us'd at all in the East, and have even varied at *Rome*. Something indeed might be alledg'd for it, if these Words had been determin'd by Scripture: But this is so far from being the case, that the Scripture is not only entirely silent upon this head, but likewise there is not to be produc'd for it, either the Canons of general Councils, or the perpetual and invariable practice of Churches. It is therefore only the substance of the form that we are to seek for in this, as well as in the other Sacraments, where it has not been determin'd; and it cannot be deny'd but that King *Edward's* Ordinal has retain'd this substance, as is evident from the quotations made out of the Prayers prescrib'd by that Ordinal.

## CHAP. VII.

*A continuation of the same Subject ; an answer to some difficulties. I. The alterations made by King Charles the II<sup>d</sup>, in the Ordinal of King Edward the VI<sup>th</sup>, are no proof there was any essential defect in Parker's Ordination.*

I Have prov'd, as I am perswaded, very evidently in the foregoing Chapter, that there was no essential defect in *Parker's Ordination*. The whole point indeed turns upon the plainest argument in nature. Imposition of hands, and the prayer which accompanies it, are the only matter and form of Ordination, as *Morinus* hath prov'd to a demonstration. The Ordinal of King *Edward*, which was us'd at *Parker's Consecration*, hath retain'd both the imposition of hands, and the substance of the prayers us'd with it in the *Roman Pontifical*. This is demonstrated from the Record of *Parker's Ordination*, and from reading the Prayers prescrib'd in that Ordinal. His Ordination therefore ought to be judg'd valid, and there is no appearance of any thing that can be urg'd to destroy it. But as there is nothing so clear in point of fact, but may be made obscure by different circumstances, which serve to vary, or even alter them entirely, it will not be improper to examine carefully what can be urg'd in opposition to the plainest, and most natural proof in the world ; which shall be done in this and the following Chapters.

One of the first difficulties, and yet not the least considerable, is that which *M. l'Abbe Renaudot* proposes, viz. That the form made use of for *Parker's Ordination* is a very equivocal one, and suits as well the Ordination of Priests, as it does that of Bishops, the Words, *Take the Holy Ghost*, agreeing equally to both. In fine, this form (if we may believe that

Author)

Author) appear'd so defective to the Bishops, who had the care of revising the Ordinal in King *Charles the second's* time, that to determine it either to the order of Priests, or that of Bishops, they thought it absolutely necessary to add new Words to the old, and after these, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, to add with regard to Priests, "for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands;" and with respect to Bishops, "for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." This addition is not to be disputed; and tho' it be not sufficient to establish the validity of the *English* Ordinations, it is, (say they) more than sufficient to attest the invalidity of the form that was us'd in the Consecration of *Parker*, a form being reckon'd invalid when it cannot determine the matter. Now an indeterminate form is incapable of determining the matter; and yet such was the form made use of in *Parker's* Ordination: His Ordination therefore cannot be defended, and is faulty in one of its most essential parts. This is the substance of *M. l'Abbe Renaudot's* Argument, which I have a little enlarg'd upon, to give it all the force that it is capable of.

But whatever force is given it, 'tis impossible to make it a solid one, because it is false in fact, and proceeds on the supposition of a Principle that is still falser. I say then, 1. That is is false in fact; for in King *Edward the sixth's* Ordinal, which was us'd till King *Charles the second's* time, the form of Words, *Take the Holy Ghost*, is there determin'd for the Ordination of Priests in a different manner from what it is for that of Bishops. The Prayers for the two Ordinations are not only different, but even the form of Words in question is not alike. That for the Ordination of Bishops runs in these Words, *Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stirre up the Grace* of



of God whiche is in thee, by imposition of handes : for God hath not geven us the spirite of feare, but of power, and love, and of sobernes : That for Priests is express'd in these terms, *Receive the Holy Ghoste, whose sinnes thou doest forgive, &c.* It is clear, that these two forms of Words are perfectly different, and relate to different Functions. 'Tis true indeed, there is nothing in them that evidently distinguishes them, so as to shew that the one was to be us'd for the Episcopacy, and the other for the Priesthood ; and that in the review made of the Ordinal under King *Charles the second*, they did make the additions to it that are mention'd ; but withal, it is evident that these additions were not made out of necessity, but only for a fuller explanation ; and that the forms of Words in question, were sufficiently determined by the preceding Prayers.

This is fully prov'd by two Reasons ; the first of which is, that they could not look upon this addition as necessary, without declaring all the Ordinations made antecedently to the addition of this clause to be null, and without the Bishops, who caused it to be inserted in the Ordinal, looking upon themselves to be ill ordained. But this never enter'd into the thoughts of any body, much less of the Bishops who were the Authors of this addition, and is a proof that they only consider'd it as a bare explication. The second Reason is, that the addition in question is unprecedented, and there is nothing like it to be found, either in the ancient Pontificals, or in those which are now in use in the Church of *Rome*. How then can the validity of Ordination be made to depend on a clause, which never was in use in any Church ; which was neither prescrib'd, nor even recommended by the *English* Ordinal before King *Charles the second* ; and which is so far from being necessary, that the form of Words is sufficiently determin'd without it ?

But besides this falsity in point of fact, which sinks the Objection at once, it is likewise founded on the supposition

supposition of a Principle, the falsity of which would of it self destroy all its force, even though the fact were true. The Principle is, that the validity of Ordination depends particularly on the form of Words, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, and that even the validity of this form depends on other Words added to it to determine it; both of which are equally false, and indefensible in sound Divinity.

The first, because (as hath been observ'd in the preceding Chapter) there is no making the validity of Ordination depend on a form of Words, which never was us'd at all in the Eastern Churches, and was never mention'd in the *Latin Church* for more than a thousand years. Yet this is the case of the form, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, and *Morinus* acknowledgeth it in exprefs terms. "These Words," \* says "he, began to be taken up by the *Latins* about 400 years ago; but among the *Greeks* and *Syrians* they neither are at present, nor ever were in use; so that they cannot with any Reason be said to belong to the substance of Ordination". So that if it can on any account be consider'd as the form, it can be only as it makes a part of the Prayers to which it is join'd of course, and which are more than sufficient to determine it, even in the *English Ordinal*, as we shall see presently.

2. Were this form of Words as ancient and universal, as indeed it is neither, the supposition would still be as wide from the truth. For, as the learned *Morinus* has very judiciously observ'd, it is ridiculous to imagine that in a body of Ceremonies and Prayers, there should be any certain Words rather than others, to produce the validity of a Sacrament, especially when these Words have not been at all determin'd by

\* Apud Latinos [hæc verba] cœpta sunt usurpari vix ab annis quadringentis: apud Græcos autem & Syros nec est nec unquam fuit illorum usus. Itaque nullâ ratione dici possunt ad Ordinis substantiam pertinere. De Sacr. Ord. part 1. exerc. 1. cap. 2. p. 22.

*Christ.* " 'Tis necessary, (says that <sup>1</sup> Author) to ob-  
 " serve, what I suppose no body will deny, that it  
 " is certainly a point of Faith to believe that the Sa-  
 " crament administred according to the form pre-  
 " scrib'd in the *Roman Pontifical*, or *Ritual*; is duly  
 " administred, and that as to what regards it, nothing  
 " is therein wanting to produce its proper effects in  
 " the receiver: But it is no necessary point of Faith  
 " to believe, what Catholick Divines are divided a-  
 " bout, whether the form and matter of the Sacra-  
 " ment be contain'd in this Part, or in these Words  
 " of the *Ritual*, unless the Church had expressly de-  
 " clar'd it to be so. --- That such particular Words  
 " make up the form of the Sacrament, That the matter  
 " of it is contain'd in this expression, and not in that, are  
 " Positions which the Schoolmen dispute about; but of  
 " so little consideration, that a Man may take which  
 " side he will, and of so uncertain a nature, that they  
 " themselves can come to no agreement upon them.  
 " And it happens sometimes, that some of them are  
 " so prodigiously in the wrong, as to mistake some  
 " things in the *Roman Pontifical* for the sole matter  
 " and form of a Sacrament, which only regard the  
 " solemnity of it, and are design'd to extend its sig-  
 " nification, and represent the benefits and intent of  
 " it." The validity therefore of the Sacrament does

<sup>1</sup> Adnotare necesse est, quod nemo mihi videtur negaturus, certum esse de fide, Sacramentum administratum juxta ritum in Pontificali seu Rituali Romano præscriptum esse legitimum, nihilque ex parte sui illi deesse ad effectum in suscipiente producendum: verum non esse necessario de fide, quod Doctores Catholici disputant, In hac parte, in his verbis Ritualis forma vel materia continetur, nisi hoc expresse dictaverit Ecclesia --- Illæ enim assertiones, ista Ritualis verba sunt Sacramenti forma, In his verò materia continetur, non autem in illis, scholasticorum doctorum sunt velitationes, quas concedet qui voluerit, & de quibus inter se sæpe dissentiunt. Contingit autem aliquando eorum aliquos à vero tam immaniter aberrare, ut in Ritu Romano ea pro solis materiis & formis adnotent, quæ ad Sacramenti tantum solemnitatem & significationis ampliacionem spectant. De pœnit. lib. 8. c. 18. p. 168.



not depend on any particular notions of Divines, but on the exact observance of the directions of the Ordinal; and this Ordinal every Church has a right, and is indeed really possess'd of the power of drawing up for it self, provided it always retains what is Essential, which should be uniform in all Places. <sup>m</sup> "For the various sentiments of the Schoolmen in relation to the particular words of the Ritual, in which they would make the form of the Sacrament to consist, is no manner of obstruction to the efficacy of the Sacraments, when what is prescrib'd in the Ordinal, or Ritual, is duly observ'd." 'Tis therefore a ridiculous pretence to make the validity of Ordination depend on such a particular form of Words, and it would prove nothing against *Parker's* Ordination, for a Man to take up with throwing such a groundless reflection on it.

3. But should we even suppose for a moment that this form of Words, *Take the Holy Ghost*, is essential to the validity of Ordination, how is it possible to prove that the validity even of this very form depends on the Words added in *King Charles the second's* time to determine it, *i. e. for the office and charge of a Bishop or Presbyter*. *M. l'Abbe Renaudot's* Argument supposes it, and 'tis the second mistake he is guilty of in his supposition; a mistake which is refuted not only by comparing the modern *Roman Pontifical* with the *English Ordinal*, but by this consideration likewise, that there is not to this day an instance to be produc'd of the like addition. For as to the Ordination of Priests, 'tis exactly the very same form that is made use of both in *King Edward the sixth's Ordinal*, and in the *Roman Pontifical*, where the Words run thus, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost, whosoever sins thou remittest, they are remitted unto them*,

<sup>m</sup> Morin. *ibid.* Nihil enim variæ Scholasticorum opinioniones de Ritualis verbis, an hic vel illic sit Sacramenti forma, Sacramentorum virtuti, cum omnia in Rituali præscripta ritè administrantur, officiant.

and

## 110 A DEFENCE of the Validity

and whosoever sins thou retainest, they are retained. And as to the Ordination of Bishops, there are no other Words join'd to the imposition of hands in the *Roman Pontifical*, but these only, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost*. I demand therefore, whether in the case of either Ordination, these words are more determinate in the *Roman Pontifical*, than they are in the *English Ordinal*? And if not, why must a clause be thought essential with regard to the latter, when the addition of it is not thought necessary in the former?

It will be said perhaps, that in the *Roman Pontifical* these words, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost*, are sufficiently determin'd by the Prayers which are us'd at every Ordination, and clearly distinguish the Ordination of Bishops from that of Priests; but that this is not the case of the *English Ordinal*. This is the only reason that could give any weight to the objection were it true; but unluckily for M. l'Abbe Renaudot, it will be shewn immediately that these two Ordinations are fully distinguish'd in that Ordinal, and that the form of words in question is therein very particularly determin'd in relation to each of the Orders of Bishop and Priest, by the Prayers and Ceremonies that distinguish these two Ordinations.

<sup>n</sup> For first, as to what concerns the Ordination of Priests, the Archdeacon presents them to the Bishop, as is done in the *Roman Pontifical*, saying, *Reverende Father in God, I present unto you these Persones present to be admitted to the Order of Priesthood*. Then the Bishop declares to the People what Ordination he is going to perform, that, if any body knows any canonical impediment against it, he may discover it. *Good People, these be thei Men whom we purpose, God willing, to receive this day unto the Holy Office of Priesthood*. Then follows the

<sup>n</sup> The forms of both these Ordinations are printed at length, among the Collections in the Appendix.

## *of the* English ORDINATIONS. III

Litany, in which is inserted this prayer, *That it may please thee to bless these thy servants now to be admitted to the order of Priesthood.* And this Litany is followed by a prayer in behalf of the persons who are taking orders, which expressly distinguishes their being set apart for the priesthood: Almighty God, geber of all good thynges, which by thy Holy Spirit hast appoynted diverse Orders of ministers in thy church, mercifully behold these thy servants now called to the office of Priesthood, &c. We see next the exhortation made by the Bishop to the Priests, to lay before them the obligations of their character, and the duties of their ministry; and immediately afterwards the questions which the Bishop puts to them, and the promises that he requires from them: The first of these questions relates to their calling, Doe you thynke in your harte that you bee truly called, accorดยng to the will of our Lorde Jesus Chyriste, and thorder of this church of Englande, to the ministration of Priesthood? At last comes the prayer, which serves instead of the preface that is in the *Roman Pontifical*, and thanks are there given to God for the favour he shews his church in supplying it with these new Priests; For these so greate benefites of thy eternal goodnes, and for that thou hast vouchsafed to call these thy servants here present to the same office and ministry of the salvation of mankyndes, we render unto the moste hartie thanks, &c. And after this prayer follows the imposition of hands, which is used concurrent with these words, Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sinnes thou doest forgive, &c. After which the Bishop delivers the Bible into the Priests hands, giving them power to preach the word of God; Take thou authoritie to preache the worde of God, &c. What is there more in the *Roman Pontifical* to determine the form *Receive thou the Holy Ghost*? How then can it be fair to maintain that this form, used as above represented, should still continue equivocal?

The



The Ordination also of Bishops, is as fully distinguished and characterized as the other. For first of all, two Bishops present the Bishop elect to the Archbishop, saying, Most reverend Father in God, we present unto you this godly and well learned Man to be consecrated Bishop. Then the Litany is said, where these Words are us'd, That it may please the to blesse thys oure Brother elected, and to sende thy Grace upon him, &c. And the Litany concludes with this Prayer, Almighty God, geber of all good thinges, whiche by thy Holy Spirite haste appointed diverse Orders of Ministers in thy Church, mercifully bestowde thys thy Servaunt nowe called to the Woorke and Ministry of a Bishop, &c. The same question is likewise put to Bishops, that was put to Priests, *viz.* Whether they are perswaded that God calls them to the Ministry for which they are presented? Whether they will be faithful in ordaining worthy Ministers, and in laying hands upon them? Whether they will make use of the authority which God put into their hands for the restraining of evil doers, for the keeping off all false and evil Doctrines, and for maintaining peace, quietness, and charity in the Church? All which questions are of such a nature, as manifestly to point out the Bishop, and are of themselves sufficient to determine the form in question, tho' there was nothing else to do it. These questions are follow'd with a Prayer, in which God is applied to for giving the Person ordain'd Grace to discharge all the duties and functions of a Bishop; and this Prayer is clos'd up with the imposition of hands, which is always us'd at the same time that these Words are pronounc'd, Take the Holy Ghost, and remembre that thou stirre up the Grace of God, &c. and with the delivery of the Book of the Gospels, which is put into the new Bishop's hands, with an exhortation to acquit himself faithfully of all the duties of a good Pastor. If these words are not sufficiently determin'd by what goes before,

fore, and what accompanies them, I can't imagine what there could be to determine them.

Indeed, what is there more in the *Roman Pontifical*, to determine this very form of words? All the world may compare them together, and be easily convinc'd of this fact, that (except some Prayers, which are annex'd to several Ceremonies that are laid aside in the *English Ordinal*) there is nothing more expressive and stronger to determine the form, *Take the Holy Ghost*, on one side than there is on the other. The presenting of the Person, as well as the Litany, is the same in both, The questions in the *English Ordinal* seem much better adapted to Bishops, than those of the Pontifical. The Prayers are equally significative on both sides, and the advice, or particular representation of the episcopal Duties, is at least as proper and characteristical in the Ordinal, as in the Pontifical. Why then should the want of a Clause added by King *Charles the second* to the form, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, be judg'd essential and sufficient to annul the Ordinations of the *English*, when the omission of that very addition is no prejudice at all to the Ordination of the *Catholick Bishops*?

4. If the use of this form is likewise taken up of late years, as the looking into Rituals and Pontificals proves; if even the addition made to the form is hitherto without an example to support it, and was never thought necessary to fix the sense of the form, *Receive, &c.* it must be said, as a great number of Divines, even Jesuits, <sup>o</sup> *Vasquez*, <sup>p</sup> *Hurtado*, <sup>q</sup> *Mærat*, <sup>r</sup> *de Rhodes*, and many others have, that the omission of this addition cannot alter the validity of the Sacrament; and that these words, *Receive, &c.* are otherwise sufficiently determined. "But you'll object, (says *Mærat*) "that these words, *Receive, &c.* seem too general: To which I answer, that they do indeed seem so, if

<sup>o</sup> Vasquez, in 3. p. disp. 240. T. 3. p. 740. <sup>p</sup> Hurtado, de Ord. p. 394. <sup>q</sup> Mærat, T. 3. de Ord. p. 692. <sup>r</sup> De Rhodes, Theol. Scholast. T. 2. p. 662.

# 114 A DEFENCE of the Validity

“ they are considered separately in themselves ; but  
 “ not if they are consider’d together with the matter  
 “ on which they are used, for that restrains their ge-  
 “ neral signification, and determines it to express the  
 “ episcopal dignity, and consequently the peculiar  
 “ office of Bishops.” The very same thing is asserted  
 by *P. de Rhodes* ; and *Vasquez* gives a farther reason for  
 it, viz. because this very indetermination argues a  
 more abundant effusion of grace, “ For (says he) there  
 “ is a more distinguishing advantage when the Holy  
 “ Spirit is given absolutely, than when he is given  
 “ only for some particular effect or other.” We may  
 conclude therefore with *Morinus*, that this addition is  
 to be ranked among those things which are inserted  
 for the solemnity, or for a fuller explanation of the  
 rite: ‘ *Ad sacramenti tantum solemnitatem & significatio-*  
*nis ampliationem spectant* ; and that *Abbe Renaudot* is fal-  
 len into the same gross error with those who are for  
 placing the matter and form, *i. e.* the essential parts  
 of Ordination in things that serve only to render it  
 more solemn, or help to explain it. “ It happens  
 “ sometimes, (says he) that some are so prodigiously in  
 “ the wrong, as to mistake some things in the *Roman*  
 “ Ritual for the sole matter and form of a Sacrament,  
 “ which only regard the solemnity of it, and are de-  
 “ sign’d to extend its signification.”

5. Some perhaps after all will say, that to make  
*Abbe Renaudot* place the essence of Ordination in this  
 form of words, *Take the Holy Ghost*, or in the addi-  
 tion made by King *Charles the second*, is to put a ri-  
 diculous notion upon him merely to gain applause by  
 refuting it ; that he never entertain’d such a sentiment,  
 but was of opinion that it consisted in every thing  
 that is prescrib’d by the *Roman Pontifical*, and there-  
 fore

‘ *Morin. de Pœn. lib. 8. p. 568.*      ‘ *Contingit autem a-*  
*liquando eorum aliquos a vero tam immaniter aberrare, ut in*  
*ritu Romano ea pro solis materiis & formis adnotent, quæ ad*  
*sacramenti tantum solemnitatem & significationis ampliatio-*  
*nem spectant.*



fore by consequence every change that could be made therein, either by way of addition or suppression, was sufficient to annul the *English* Ordinations.

But 'tis an easy matter to shew, that nothing is put upon M. *l'Abbe Renaudot* ; for he says expressly in his *Memoire*, " That the form prescrib'd by King *Edward's* Ordinal, cannot be a valid form, because it " is full as well adapted to the Ordination of Priests, " as it is to that of Bishops ; and that this was the " reason why on the restoration of King *Charles* the " *second*, they added some words to that form, to de- " termine the sense of it either to the priestly or the e- " piscopal Character." Now 'tis certain, that the form of words, *Take the Holy Ghost*, is the very form to which the addition was made in King *Charles* the *second's* time. It must therefore be that very form of words which M. *l'Abbe Renaudot* look'd upon as the form of Ordination ; and one of his reasons for condemning it was certainly this, that it suited as well the ordination of Priests, as that of Bishops. But tho' M. *l'Abbe Renaudot* had not said this in such express terms as he has done, yet his reasoning plainly supposes it. For an alteration made in a form of words can never be deem'd essential, unless the form it self be looked upon as essential. Now that Author looks upon the omission of the clause, added under King *Charles* the *second*, to be an essential one ; and consequently was of opinion, That that very form of words was the form of Ordination ; which is all that is ascrib'd to him in the objection drawn from his *Memoire*.

6. I wish indeed M. *l'Abbe Renaudot* had only maintain'd that the essence of Ordination consisted truly in all that is prescrib'd in the Pontifical, and that no alteration could be made in it, without rendering the Ordination null. And yet, even this hypothesis, tho' more rational and better founded than the other, can never be supported. For tho' it is not always evident, and we do not know with an entire

certainly, in what particular point the matter and form of a Sacrament consist; yet it is always certain, and always plain, that there are many things which can never be consider'd under any other notion than as mere Ceremonies. Thus, for example, no body doubts, but in the administration of Baptism, a great number of things, which have been only added to render that office more solemn, such as the Unctions and Exorcisms, may be omitted without affecting the substance of that Sacrament. So, to stick to the subject we are upon, there is no Divine has any doubt, but that in the ceremony of Ordination, there are many things that may be either left out, or practis'd, without affecting it one way or other, and that a Man may be effectually made a Bishop, for example, tho' they left out the ceremony of the Ring, the Mitre, the Gloves, &c. with all the Prayers that are annex'd to them. *M. l'Abbe Renaudot's* supposition is no more to be supported this way than the other: And in order to judge of the validity of an Ordination, we must necessarily have recourse to the usual distinction of what is essential, from what is not so; and tho' we cannot tell exactly what particular words rather than others constitute the form, yet we can see plainly, that several contribute nothing at all to it; that provided we preserve the sense of others, there is nothing else wanting to make the Sacrament valid.

To sum up this answer in a few words. Either *M. l'Abbe Renaudot* places the form of Ordination in these words alone, *Take the Holy Ghost*, or in this form of words as us'd jointly with the clause added under King *Charles the second*, or else in the Prayers dispers'd throughout the whole Ceremony; for the idea and notion of the form in the Sacrament of Ordination can agree with nothing but one of these three things. Now if it consists in these words alone, *Take the Holy Ghost*, we can't say that the *English* Ordinations are less valid than those of the *Catholicks*, since it has been clearly prov'd that they  
are

are as much determin'd in King *Edward's* Ordinal by the Prayers and Ceremonies which are us'd with them, as they are in the *Roman* Pontifical. If it consists in that form of Words as us'd jointly with the addition of King *Charles the second*; the Author must either condemn all the Catholick Ordinations, or honestly own that he is mistaken in making the validity of Ordination depend on a clause added without any example, authority, or necessity for it. If, in fine, it be in the Prayers dispers'd throughout the Ceremony of Ordination, that M. l'Abbe *Renaudot* makes the essence of the form consist; how dares he assert that this form is as much adapted to the Ordination of a Priest, as to that of a Bishop, when these Prayers are as different from one another, in King *Edward's* Ordinal, as they are in the *Roman* Pontifical? Besides, since they have in the Ordinal retain'd all the substance of the Prayers of the Pontifical, and the grammatical Text has never been determin'd, either it must be allow'd that there was no defect in *Parker's* Ordination with regard to the form, or it must be prov'd, that either the Scripture, or the decree of an oecumenical Council, or the perpetual and universal practice of the whole Church has annex'd the validity of Ordination to one single form of Prayers and Ceremonies; for otherwise, the pretence is absurd, and the objection both weak and groundless.

---

CHAP. VIII.

*Answer to the second difficulty. The form of Ordination prescrib'd by King Edward the VI<sup>th</sup>, was not prohibited by Law, when Parker was consecrated.*

Supposing it allow'd, that there was no essential defect in the form prescrib'd by King *Edward's* Ordinal, yet it may perhaps be urg'd, That this Or-



dinal it self being unauthoriz'd, and prohibited by Law, there is no looking on an Ordination to be valid, which was made by a new Ritual, neither adopted, nor authoriz'd by any Church. It was easy to see that this fact would certainly be contested, and therefore M. *l'Abbe Renaudot* relates a passage of History that happen'd under Queen *Elizabeth*, by which he pretends to demonstrate, that the *English* themselves own'd the invalidity of the Ordinations made under that Queen, according to King *Edward's* Ordinal. The fact, as M. *l'Abbe Renaudot* relates it, is as follows.

*Boner* in 1564, was prosecuted by *Horn* Bishop of *Winchester*, on account of his refusal to take the Oath of Supremacy. He made no answer to the summons, but that it behov'd *Horn*, and the rest of the Bishops nominated by Queen *Elizabeth*, to prove that they were Bishops. The Judges not caring to decide this affair, it was brought before the Parliament, who declar'd, That the Persons ordain'd according to King *Edward's* form of Ordination, were truly Bishops; but the prosecution against *Boner* was dropp'd. Now, our Author thinks this relation proves that the form of Ordination prescrib'd by *Edward* the sixth was unauthoriz'd; for *Boner* having refus'd to acknowledge *Horn* for Bishop, on account of his being ordain'd by King *Edward's* Ordinal, and the Judges not daring to give any sentence against *Boner*, he infers hence, that they did not indeed look upon *Horn* as a true Bishop. Besides, the Parliament, before whom the affair was brought, let *Boner* alone, and excused him from taking the Oath of Supremacy; which seems a glaring proof of *Boner's* being in the right, and an owning of the reason he had alledg'd. It should then be taken for granted, (he thinks) that King *Edward's* Ordinal was even then unauthoriz'd, and that consequently *Parker's* Ordination should be deem'd null and invalid.

That

That the Ordinations made according to King *Edward's* Ordinal have been look'd upon as null by the greatest part of Catholicks, is a fact not to be contested; but this is not the point in question. Thus, that *Boner* thought the Bishop of *Winchester's* Ordination null, is what may be well enough granted, without bringing the dispute to any decision: But it is certainly a false consequence to infer from thence, that King *Edward's* Ordinal was prohibited by Law, and that the *English* Judges approv'd *Boner's* refusal on this pretext. To clear up the matter, which may be of some importance, we must have recourse to original instruments and writings, and not confine our selves to what some byass'd Writers have advanc'd, who strain every thing to suit their prejudices, and without distinction confound truth and falshood as their caprice leads them.

One thing however is unanimously allow'd, viz. That the Bishop of *Winchester* having tender'd the Oath of Supremacy to *Boner*, he refus'd it for two reasons. 1. Because he believ'd it unlawful. And, 2. Because *Horn* had no right to require it of him. Upon this refusal, *Horn* had him cited into the King's-Bench, whereupon they assign'd him, according to custom, Council to plead for him. These Council were *Ployden*, *Wray* and *Lovelace*. It is not necessary here to quote all that they alledg'd to justify *Boner's* refusal; 'tis enough to insist on the Reasons which relate to the validity of *Horn's* Ordination, and are taken from *Boner's* own draught of them, of which some writers have given us a particular account.

Among the rest I find two; the first, which is mention'd by the \* Author of the *Annals of the Reformation* under Queen *Elizabeth*, is, that *Horn* was not consecrated according to the Laws and Statutes of the Realm, which require that a Bishop be ordain'd by

\* Heylin's *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 345. Collier's *Hist. Eccles. part 2.* p. 492. \* *Strype's Annals*, T. 3. c. 34. p. 342.

his Metropolitan, assisted by two other Bishops, or else by four Bishops; an injunction which was not observ'd in his case. The other, which <sup>y</sup> *Heylin* and *Collier* take notice of in their Histories is, that the form for consecrating Archbishops and Bishops, which had been approv'd of in Parliament under *Edward* the sixth, had been repeal'd in the first year of *Queen Mary*, and was not re-establish'd at the time that *Horn* was consecrated Bishop of *Winchester*; from whence *Boner's* Council argued, that his Ordination not being made according either to the *Roman Pontifical*, which had been revived on *Queen Mary's* coming to the Crown, or to the Laws which had made no provision for re-establishing of *King Edward's* Ordinal, was absolutely null, and consequently *Horn* was not really a Bishop.

Thus far all Writers are well enough agreed; but they are far enough from agreeing that these Reasons were allow'd by the Judges, and still farther from entertaining *Boner's* sentiments, that *Horn* was not really a Bishop. This is still the less probable, because these two Reasons lead to a falsity, being founded upon facts that are themselves false.

And, 1. 'Tis false in fact, that they did not observe in *Horn's* case the Laws of the Kingdom, made the twenty fifth of *Henry* the eighth, concerning the consecration of Bishops, since it is evident from *Parker's* Register <sup>z</sup>, that *Horn*, and *Scambler* Bishop of *Peterborough* were consecrated *February* the sixteenth 1567, by *Parker* himself, assisted by the Bishops of *St. Davids*, *London* and *Coventry*.

If *Boner*, and after him *Stapleton*, reproach'd *Horn* for not being consecrated, it was not for their want of knowing this consecration, but because they pretended that the consecrators themselves were not Bishops. "Who does not know, says *Stapleton* <sup>a</sup>, that you

" and

<sup>y</sup> *Heylin's Hist. of Reformat.* p. 345. *Collier's Hist. Eccles.* part 2. p. 493. <sup>z</sup> *Reg. Parker*, fol. 88. <sup>a</sup> *Quis nescit te,*  
tuosque



“and your Brother Bishops were ordain’d not only  
 “differently from what the Canons of the Church,  
 “but also from what your own Acts of Parliament  
 “require? With what face then can you assume to  
 “your self the title of Bishop of *Winchester*, which  
 “the Laws of the Land, as well as of the Church  
 “deny you?” Here, we see, *Stapleton* does not dis-  
 pute their Ordination in general, but only the cano-  
 nicalness of their Ordination, and its being made ac-  
 cording to Law and antient usage. <sup>b</sup> “You are no  
 “Bishop, says he, because --- you cannot shew that  
 “you were call’d and ordain’d in the regular and  
 “usual manner.” And he was of opinion, that this  
 want of a canonical and regular Consecration, was a  
 sufficient reason against his acknowledging *Horn* for a  
 Bishop. <sup>c</sup> “For though he might style you Bishop  
 “of *Winchester*, at the same time that he knew you  
 “had neither a regular call, nor a canonical Consecra-  
 “tion, --- yet I am in the right to declare, that  
 “you are neither a Bishop, nor Bishop of *Winchester*.”  
 All *Stapleton*’s reasoning amounts to no more than  
 this, that *Horn* was not consecrated after a canonical  
 and legal manner. But suppose a Bishop be not con-  
 secrated canonically, or intrudes into a See from  
 which his Predecessor has been illegally depos’d, does  
 it follow from thence, that his Ordination is not va-  
 lid? *Stapleton* proves no such thing, and the contra-  
 ry is now maintain’d as a Principle. Nothing there-

tuosque collegas, non dico aliter quàm requirunt Canones Ec-  
 clesiæ, sed nec secundùm præscriptum statutorum vestrorum or-  
 dinatos esse? Quà ergo fronte, quàm facie nomen D. Episcopi  
 Wintoniensis tibi arrogare audes, quo leges omnes tam muni-  
 cipales quàm Ecclesiasticæ te privant? *Stapleton*, Tom. 2. oper  
 p. 839.

<sup>b</sup> Propterea non Episcopus, quia--- nec appro-  
 batam & assuetam vocationem aut consecrationem ostendere  
 unquam poteris.

<sup>c</sup> Nam licèt ipse te Episcopum Wintoni-  
 enssem appellaverit, quem satis novit & legitima vocatione &  
 canonica consecratione destitutum--- ego tamen verè denuntio  
 te nec Episcopum esse, nec D. Episcopum Wintoniensem. *ibid.*  
 p. 838.

fore can be falser, than the first cause of exception alledg'd by *Boner*, it being founded on the want of a Consecration by the Metropolitan assisted by two Bishops, whereas *Horn* was actually so consecrated, as is prov'd by the publick Records and Registers.

Accordingly this *first* Reason was not that which was most insisted on; but the *second*, viz. That King *Edward's* Ordinal, which was us'd in *Horn's* Consecration, was not re-establish'd by Law, at the time of his Ordination, and much less was it at the time of *Parker's*, who was ordain'd fourteen months before the other. But this second fact is not a jot truer than the former; and if the Judges were puzzled with it, and the affair remitted to the Parliament, it was only on account of an ambiguity, which it is necessary to clear up here, in order to set this transaction in a true light.

In 1548, King *Edward* had caus'd a new Directory for divine Service and the administration of the Sacraments to be drawn up, which was call'd *The Book of Common Prayer*, and was appointed to be us'd by <sup>d</sup> Act of Parliament. In 1549, a form was likewise drawn up, and warranted by the like authority of Parliament <sup>e</sup>, for the consecration of Bishops, and the ordination of Priests and Deacons, those several Orders and Functions being still preserv'd, notwithstanding the alterations brought about in that Church: And, in 1552, this form was annex'd to *The Book of Common-Prayer*, which had then undergone a review. This Book so review'd and augmented, was again authoriz'd by Act of Parliament <sup>f</sup>, and this addition of the Ordinal became part of that new Liturgy. And as that Act is of great use to clear up the difficulty before us, I shall quote almost the whole of it, as it

<sup>d</sup> *Statutes at large*, Tom. i. p. 646.  
*Heylin's Hist. of Reform.* p. 83.

<sup>e</sup> *Ibid.* p. 674. and  
<sup>f</sup> *Statutes at large*, Tom. i. p. 676. N. B. This Act of Parliament, and the following ones, are printed at length among the Collections, at the end of this Treatise.

is printed in the Collection of the Statutes of the Kingdom. It runs in these terms, Because there hath risen in the use and exercise of the aforesaid common service in the Church heretofore set forth, divers doubts, for the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same, rather by the curiosity of the minister and mistakers, than of any other worthy cause; therefore as well for the more plain and ~~and~~ manifest explanation thereof, as for the more perfection of the said Order of common Service — the King's most excellent Majesty, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, hath caused the aforesaid Order of Common Service intituled, The Book of Common-Prayer, to be faithfully and godly perused, explained and made fully perfect, and by the aforesaid Authority hath annexed and joined — a form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, to be of like force, authority, and value, as the same like aforesaid Book intituled The Book of Common-Prayer, was before, and to be accepted, received, used, and esteemed in like sort and manner, and with the same clauses of provisions and exceptions, to all intents, constructions and purposes as by the said Act of Parliament made in the second year of the Kings Majesties reign, was ordained, limited, expressed and appointed for the uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments throughout the Realm, upon such several pains as in the said Act of Parliament is expressed: And the said former Act to stand in full force and strength, to all intents and constructions, and to be applied, practised and put in ure, to and for the establishing of The Book of Common-Prayer, now explained and hereunto annexed; and also the said form of making Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, hereunto annexed — as it was for the former Book. These words, and also the said form of making Archbishops — hereunto annex'd, — as it was for the former Book, are particularly remarkable, and



and ought to be carried in mind throughout the examination of the difficulty before us.

This Statute was repeal'd in 1553, in the first year of Queen Mary 8. *The Book of Common-Prayer* was abolish'd, and the *Roman Pontifical* came again in use for the Ordination of Bishops. But one of the first things that Queen *Elizabeth* took care of, as soon as she came to the Crown, was to put all things again upon the same footing as they were in King *Edward's* time; and for this end, in her first Parliament held A. D. 1559, *The Book of Common-Prayer* was re-establish'd with all the authority that it had before. Now this Statute was prior to all the Ordinations made in Queen *Elizabeth's* reign; and as the determination of the question depends upon it, it will be of use to quote it here, as it is printed in the *Statutes at large*. It runs thus, <sup>h</sup> Whereas at the death of King *Edward VI.* there remained one uniform Order of common Service and Prayer, and of the administration of the Sacraments — set forth in one Book intituled, *The Book of Common-Prayer*, — authorized by Act of Parliament holden in the fifth and sixth years of — King *Edward VI.*; — the which was repealed and taken away by — Act of Parliament in the first year of — Queen *Mary*, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the Professors of the truth of *Christ's Religion*: Be it therefore enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, That the said Statute of Repeal, and every thing therein contained, only concerning the said Book and the service and administration of the Sacraments, Rites and Ceremonies contained or appointed in or by the said Book, shall be void and of none effect, from and after the Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist next coming, and that the said Book, with the Order of Service — with the Alterations and Additions therein added and appointed by this Statute, shall stand and — be in full force and effect — any thing in the foregoing

<sup>a</sup> *Statutes at large*, Tom. 1. p. 709. Heylin's *Hist. of Reformation* p. 298. <sup>b</sup> *Statutes at large*, Tom. 1. p. 763, 764

Statute of Repeal to the contrary notwithstanding. And further be it enacted — That all and singular Ministers of any Cathedral or Parish Church — shall, from and after the Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist next coming, be bounden to say and use the Mattens, Evening-song, celebration of the Lord's Supper and administration of each of the Sacraments, and all the common and open prayer, in such order and form, as is mentioned in the said Book so authorized by Parliament, in the said fifth and sixth years of the reign of King Edward VI. with one Alteration or Addition, &c.

This is the tenour of the famous Act of Parliament of 1559, made antecedent to the consecration of *Parker*, and consequently to that of *Horn*; and in conformity to it, the Parliament of 1566 declar'd all the Ordinations made under Queen *Elizabeth*, according to King *Edward's* Ordinal, to be valid, as appears by that Act, which is printed in the said Collection of Statutes. <sup>i</sup> Be it now declared and enacted by the Authority of this present Parliament, that the said Act and Statute made in the first year of the reign of our said Sovereign Lady the Queen's Majesty, whereby the said Book of Common-Prayer — is authorized and allowed to be used, shall stand and remain good and perfect to all respects and purposes; and that such Order and Form for consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops, and for the making of Priests, Deacons and Ministers, as was set forth in the time of the said late King Edward VI. and added to the said Book of Common-Prayer, and authorized by Parliament in the fifth and sixth years of the said late King, shall stand and be in full force and effect — And that all Persons that have been or shall be made, ordered or consecrated — after the said Form and Order, — are declared and enacted to be, and shall be Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, &c. and rightly made, ordered and consecrated, &c.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. p. 816. Sect. III.

'Tis plain from the bare reading of these two last Statutes, that the Ordinal of King *Edward* the *sixth*, had been re-establish'd in the first year of Queen *Elizabeth*, i. e. in 1559. But how then could *Boner* and *Stapleton* say, that *Horn*, who was ordain'd according to that Ordinal in 1561, was not consecrated according to that Law? And how could the Judges be under any difficulty in determining upon this head? This is what I am now to explain.

By the Statute of 1552, *Edward* the *sixth* had added a form for consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons to *The Book of Common-Prayer*, and it was from that time to make a part of the said Book. In 1553 this Book was abolish'd, together with the form for the Ordination of Bishops. In 1559, when Queen *Elizabeth* caused the Statute of 1553 to be repeal'd, there is express mention made of *The Book of Common-Prayer*, but not of the addition that had been made to it, i. e. of the form of Ordination, because it was look'd upon as part of the said Book. This omission is the occasion of all the difficulty in this point; for this form having been abolish'd by Name in Queen *Mary's* reign, and not re-establish'd by Name in Queen *Elizabeth's*, *Boner's* Council pretended that the Ordination was null, and *Horn* was no Bishop. This seem'd a point of consequence enough to be laid before the Parliament in 1566, and it occasion'd the last Statute that I have quoted, by which the Ordinations made in Queen *Elizabeth's* time are declar'd good and valid, notwithstanding any pretences to the contrary.

The Parliament in determining about the validity of the *English* Ordinations, declar'd expressly, that the form of Ordination had been re-establish'd in 1559. And if we consider the case seriously, they could not have determin'd otherwise: For by the Statute of 1552, the form of Ordination was made a part of *The Book of Common-Prayer*. The Statute is express in this point; and *Heylin*, who writes a History of the Reformation, takes particular notice of



it. <sup>k</sup> The Bishops, says he, and Divines appointed  
 “ to draw up the form of Ordination directed by Par-  
 “ liament, went on with that work, and regulated  
 “ themselves chiefly by the canons of the council of  
 “ Carthage in 401; which, tho’ it was but a national  
 “ one, has been nevertheless received and approved  
 “ by all the western churches in this particular. This  
 “ work being finished, they made use of the Book till  
 “ 1552, without issuing out any new order in rela-  
 “ tion to it: But in 1552 that form was added to the  
 “ second Liturgy, and approved and confirmed as a  
 “ part thereof by act of Parliament.”

This Book thus review’d and enlarged with this  
 addition of the Ordinal, was afterwards suppressed in  
 1553, and was the very same that was re-established  
 by Queen Elizabeth in 1559. The aforesaid Statute  
 made in that year, mentions in two places the re-esta-  
 blishment of this Book as it had been approved and  
 confirmed, not by the Act of 1548, but by that of  
 1552. Now in *The Book of Common-Prayer* approved  
 by Parliament in 1552, the form of Ordination was  
 inserted and made part of it, as appears 1<sup>st</sup>. By the very  
 edition of the Book itself in 1552, which is to be met  
 with in the library of M. le Comte de Seignelay, where  
 in the table of the contents of that book, we find in  
 the 21<sup>st</sup> article this title, *The Form and Manner of ma-  
 king and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*;  
 and the date of the impression of the whole Book  
 is put at the end of this very part of the work.  
 2<sup>dly</sup>, It appears likewise in as convincing a manner by  
 the very words of the Statute of 1552, which runs in  
 these terms, <sup>l</sup> The King’s most excellent Majesty—hath  
 caused the aforesaid—Book of Common-Prayer to be  
 faithfully and godly perused, explained, and made fully  
 perfect,—adding also a form and manner of making and  
 consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, &c. to be of like

<sup>k</sup> Heylin’s *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 83.  
 large, tom. i. p. 676.

<sup>l</sup> Statutes at

force, authority, and value, &c, and the said Book so review'd and augmented, shall be used in his Majesty's Dominions with the same clauses, &c. This expression, adding also, is remarkable, because it clearly proves that the Parliament looked upon the form of Ordination, only as an addition made to the *Book of Common-Prayer*. It was at last so understood by all the Kingdom; for they made no scruple of using this Ordinal of King *Edward* for the Ordination of the Bishops named by Queen *Elizabeth*, thinking it re-establish'd by the Act of Parliament that was made for the re-establishment of the *Book of Common-Prayer*.

This is very judiciously represented by Dr. *Heylin* in his History of the Reformation. <sup>m</sup> "This matter, says he, was brought before the Parliament which met September 30, 1566. Every thing was there debated with great care, and they declared that the form of Ordination being in 1552, added to the *Book of Common Prayer* as a part of it, or at least as a sort of an appendix to it, their forgetting to mention it by name when they re-established the *Book of Common-Prayer*, was an omission of no consequence, and that it was indeed re-established, if not in express terms, yet at least in the intention of the Parliament. But a doubt arising on account of the words of the Statute, they enacted it over again, and declared at the same time, that all Persons who had been, or should be ordained according to that form, were and should be deemed to be well ordained and rightly made Bishops." This, as we have seen above, is the very import of the Statute of 1566.

And even before the Parliament had declared their sense on this head, there was no manner of doubt but the form of Ordination was included in the re-establishment of the *Book of Common-Prayer*. This is very clear from the 36<sup>th</sup> article of the Convocation held at London in 1562. <sup>n</sup> "The Book of Consecration of

<sup>m</sup> *History of the Reformation*, p. 346. articles, &c. p. 221.

<sup>n</sup> *Collection of Ar-*

"Archbishops

“ Archbishops and Bishops, and ordering of Priests  
 “ and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of *Edward*  
 “ the *sixth*, and confirmed at the same time by au-  
 “ thority of Parliament, doth contain all things ne-  
 “ cessary to such Consecration and ordering; and  
 “ whosoever are consecrated and ordered according  
 “ to the rites of that Book since the second year of  
 “ the forenamed King *Edward*, unto this time or  
 “ hereafter, shall be consecrated and ordered accord-  
 “ ing to the same rites, we decree all such to be  
 “ rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and or-  
 “ dered.”

Now the Ordinations made since the year 1559, could not be judged by the Convocation to be valid and legal, if the Parliament had not at that time given the form of Ordination the same authority it had under *Edward* the *sixth*; and yet the Parliament had given it this authority no other way than by re-establishing the *Book of Common-Prayer*, of which the form of Ordination had made a part ever since 1552. This is very well observed by the learned *Burnet* Bishop of *Salisbury*, in his exposition of the thirty-nine Articles of the church of *England*. ° “ When *Queen Elizabeth*, “ says he, came to the Crown, King *Edward's Book of Common Prayer* was re-established, and the Statute of *Queen Mary* was repealed. But the Book of Ordination was not expressly named, being deemed part of that *Book of Common-Prayer*, as it had been made in King *Edward's* time, insomuch that it was not thought necessary to make express mention of it, any more than of the other Offices that are contained in that Book. Bishop *Boner* urged, that the Book having been repealed by name in *Queen Mary's* time, and not being re-established by name in *Queen Elizabeth's*, did still remain condemned by Law, and consequently the Ordinations made

° *An Exposition of the 39 Articles, &c. Art. 36. p. 377. Bramhall, tom. I. p. 452.*



130 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

“ according to that Book, were made without au-  
 “ thority. But it is plain, that in reasoning thus  
 “ upon the letter of the Law, no conclusion can be  
 “ drawn against the validity of the Ordinations, con-  
 “ sidered as a sacred and ecclesiastical act, but only as  
 “ a civil and legal one; and therefore the next Parli-  
 “ ament declared, that the *Book of Ordination* ought  
 “ to be considered as part of the *Book of Common-*  
 “ *Prayer.*”

The very terms too of the Statute of 1559, would be of themselves sufficient to demonstrate the re-establishment of the form of Ordination: For though there is no exprefs mention made of it, yet it is said expressly in that Statute, that they re-established the *Book of Common-Prayer*, and every thing therein contained, relating to divine service, the administration of sacraments, and the rites and ceremonies of the church of *England*; and certainly the form of Ordination ought to be looked upon as part either of the administration of the sacraments, or at least of the rites and ceremonies of the church.

Besides, this very Statute contains a repeal of that which had been made in 1553, in the beginning of *Queen Mary's* reign, and of every thing enacted in it relating to divine service, the administration of the sacraments, and the rites and ceremonies of the church; which Statute had before expressly repealed every thing that *Edward the sixth* had ordered in relation to the *Book of Common-Prayer*, the form of Ordinations, the communion in both kinds. And Dr. *Heylin* takes particular notice of it <sup>q</sup>. “ By this act,” says he, speaking of the Statute of *Queen Mary*, they “ repealed all the Statutes made for the administra-  
 “ tion of the communion in both kinds, for the esta-  
 “ blishment of the first and second liturgy, for con-  
 “ firming the new form of Ordination of Bishops, &c.  
 “ for the abrogating of certain fasts and festivals that

<sup>p</sup> Stat. at large, tom. I. p. 709.    <sup>q</sup> Hist. of Reform. p. 198.

“ had

“ had been kept formerly, for authorizing the marriage of Priests, and legitimating their children, without mentioning any thing of the Statute made for empowering the King to appoint Bishops by his Letters Patents, and prohibiting the Bishops to exercise their jurisdiction except only in the King’s name, as if this last Statute did not deserve to be mentioned.” When therefore the Statute of 1559, re-establishes every thing that had been repealed by the other in relation to divine service, the administration of the sacraments, and the rites of the church, and that repeal expressly mentioned and comprehended the form of Ordination; does it not evidently follow that this form of Ordination, which was one of the most essential parts of the administration of the sacraments, and of the rites of the church, was re-establish’d, as well as the Book to which it had been annexed by a particular act of Parliament? <sup>r</sup> *Sanders* makes no difficulty to acknowledge it, when speaking expressly of the form of Ordination establish’d by *Edward the sixth*, he says, that *Queen Mary* repealed it, and *Queen Elizabeth* re-established it. “ *Queen Mary*, says he, repealed these new Laws, and *Queen Elizabeth* re-established them in their full force.” The late *M. Bossuet* Bishop of *Meaux*, whose testimony cannot be suspected in this dispute, was so convinced of the evidence of this fact, that in his *History of Variations*, he owns expressly that the Parliament of 1559, re-established the form of Ordination appointed in *King Edward’s* time. <sup>s</sup> “ Weak Bishops, says he, wretched Clergy! who chose rather to take their form of Consecration from the Book drawn up ten years before under *Edward the sixth*, and confirmed by the authority of Parliament, than from the Book of the sacraments of *St. Gregory*, the author of their

<sup>r</sup> De Schism. Angl. lib. 3. p. 348. Has leges novas sustulit Maria; Elizabetha in integrum restituit ac renovavit— <sup>s</sup> Hist. des Variations, liv. 10. tom. 2. p. 94.

“ conversion.—Upon this form those Bishops founded  
 “ the validity of their own Consecration, and that of  
 “ the Ordination of their Priests and Deacons; and  
 “ they did so in conformity with an Ordinance of  
 “ Parliament in 1559, when the scruples about their  
 “ Ordination were taken away by an act which au-  
 “ thorized the form of Ordinations annexed to King  
 “ *Edward's* Liturgy; insomuch, that if the Parliament  
 “ had not made those acts, the Ordination of all the  
 “ Clergy might have been called in question.” Thus  
 did that learned Bishop make no scruple to own that  
 from the year 1559, *i. e.* before any Bishop was or-  
 dained, King *Edward's* Ordinal was re-established,  
 and his testimony is of weight enough to be put in  
 the balance with many others.

But it is still more surprizing, that, as *Bramhall* observes, the Jesuits themselves, against whom he writes, and who were forward enough to countenance the Nagshead Fable, did not insist at all on the Book of Ordinations being unauthorized, but owned on the contrary, that the Parliament had re-established it in full force in 1559.

This was so clear, that even since the year 1566, the re-establishment of this form of Ordination, and of every thing relating to divine service, has been expressed in no other manner than by the *Book of Common-Prayer*, judging rightly that the title of that Book alone took in all the branches of the office of the church. This appears by the Statute of 1662, passed just after the Restoration of King *Charles the second*, where it is said, “ That Queen *Elizabeth* having re-established in the first year of her reign, an uniformity in publick worship and prayer, in the administration of the sacraments, and the rites and ceremonies of the church of *England*, by the re-establishment made of the *Common-Prayer*, it was a great misfortune for religion, that in the time of the troubles and rebellion

“ *Bramhall*, tom. 1. p. 465. “ *Stat. at large*, tom. 2. p. 1198



of the English ORDINATIONS. 133

that order and uniformity had been laid aside, and therefore to remedy it, the King, by consent of Parliament, enacts, "That they shall use again *the Book of Common-Prayer*, together with the Psalter, and the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, &c."

'Tis evident from the very manner of expression, that King *Charles the second's* avowed intention was only to re-establish what Queen *Elizabeth* herself had re-established by the Statute enjoining the use of *the Common-Prayer*. And yet he re-established the form of Ordination as a part of *the Book of Common-Prayer*, for he joins the form of Ordination as well as the Psalter to that Book, and undoubtedly the Psalter was a part of it. There cannot therefore be any room to doubt but that from the first year of Queen *Elizabeth*, i. e. from 1559, before the Ordination of any Bishop, the Ordinal of *Edward the sixth* was re-established, and consequently was not prohibited by Law, when *Parker* was consecrated.

But it may be objected, that if *Horn's* Ordination according to King *Edward's* Ordinal was judged valid, why should *Boner* be discharged from the prosecution carried on against him by the Bishop of *Winchester*, and the reasons he alledged for refusing the Oath be approved of? For dismissing the prosecution against him, was a sort of acknowledgment that *Horn* was not truly a Bishop.

This is the objection, but the consequence is neither just nor true; for in 1562, the Bishops of the Convocation held at *London*, had declared, that the Bishops ordained by King *Edward's* Ordinal, were well and rightly consecrated; and pursuant to this declaration, they went on to ordain new Bishops according to the same Ordinal, without any new declarations intervening on the side of the Parliament; which proves sufficiently, that in their opinion *Boner's* pretence was groundless.

### 134 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

And in 1566, when this affair was laid before the Parliament, they made a solemn declaration there, agreeable to this determination of the Convocation, that *Horn* and his Collegues were truly Bishops, and had been validly and legally ordained. They were never under any doubt in this particular; and if *Boner's* council made the most of this pretence for refusing the Oath, it was because they had nothing more plausible to object against the Bishop of *Winchester*. However, though they had no doubt at all as to the validity of the Ordination, yet as the Law was not so clear and expresse as it might have been, it was a sort of justice to dismiss the persons prosecuted, whose cause is always favourable, whenever the Law stands in need of an explanation. Besides, as *Dr. Heylin* remarks,<sup>x</sup> "they considered *Boner* and the rest of the " Bishops as Men that had suffered upon that account " by the loss of their Bishopricks;" and were well enough inclined to treat them with some indulgence; and the rather because, as the author of *Parker's Life*, and *Heylin*<sup>y</sup> says, they made it a rule to themselves to observe a good deal of caution and moderation in the affair of the Oath of Supremacy, that they might not exasperate the *Roman* Catholicks, but bring them gradually by gentle measures to come in to what they required from them, without raising any disturbance; " which favour was indulged in hope " of gaining them by fair means to a sense of their " duty." And in fact, it appears from a Letter of *Parker's* to Sir *William Cecil* Secretary of State<sup>z</sup>, that *Queen Elizabeth* would not push any Man to extremity on account of the Oath, but did not care to appear in it, for fear of disobliging those of her party who were eager for the contrary, and therefore left it to *Parker* and *Cecil* to manage the matter between them with circumspection. In this disposition of mind

<sup>x</sup> *Hist. of Reform.* p. 346.    <sup>y</sup> *Life of Parker*, p. 125. *Heylin*  
*Hist. of Reform.* p. 346.    <sup>z</sup> *Life of Parker*, 125.

that the Queen certainly was in, whose interest and views gave a turn to all the resolutions of Parliament, it is no way strange either that the prosecution against *Boner* should be stopped, or that at the same time *Horn* should be authentically recognized as a Bishop.

It may perhaps be objected, that *Boner* was so far from being discharged from the prosecution against him out of any such motive, that the Judges declared, even in Queen *Elizabeth's* reign, that the Bishops ordained in King *Edward's* time were not Bishops. This is pretended to be proved from a work of Lord Chief Justice *Brooks*, printed with that Queen's privilege, out of which *Champney* and *Ward*<sup>a</sup> have drawn this Report: *Dicitur que Evesque in tempore Edw. VI. ne fueront sacrés, & ideo ne fueront Evesques, & ideo leas pur ans-p tiels, & confirmé per le Deane & Chapt. ne liera le successeur. Car tiels ne unq; fueront Evesques, contr. de Evesque deprived qui fuit Evesque in fait tempore dimissionis & confirmat. fact.* A report which *Champney* translates thus, *Dicitur Episcopos tempore Edwardi sexti creatos, non fuisse consecratos, atque ideo non fuisse Episcopos; ac proinde locationes terrarum pro certo annorum termino per eos factas; confirmatas etiam per Decanum & Capitulum, successorem ejus non obligabunt, quia tales nunquam fuerant Episcopi:* It was alledged that the Bishops made in *Edward the sixth's* time, were not consecrated, and therefore were not Bishops; so that Leases made by them of Lands for a term of years, though confirmed by the Dean and Chapter, shall not oblige the successor, because they never were Bishops. Such a judgment as this, given in Queen *Elizabeth's* time, shews what a notion they had even in that Queen's time of the Ordinations made according to the Ordinal of *Edward the sixth*, and how many Persons well skilled in the Laws, judged them

<sup>a</sup> Champ. de Vocat. Ministr. c. 13. p. 431. Ward's Controv. of Ordinat. p. 28.



defective, as *Champney* says. “<sup>b</sup> The Judges of the Kingdom even under Queen *Elizabeth*, entertained such doubts about the episcopal Ordinations made in King *Edward*’s reign, that they really looked upon them to be null.” And the same judgment should be made of the Ordinations in Queen *Elizabeth*’s time, since they followed King *Edward*’s Ordinal. They were therefore at that time looked upon as invalid, notwithstanding the pretended decisions of Parliament, which were not sufficient to satisfy the minds of Men, and give them a favourable opinion of the new Ordinations.

This is *Champney*’s objection, and were there any truth in it, it would be a difficult matter to reconcile what was done in Queen *Elizabeth*’s time with the report or decision just now quoted. But that writer had no view but to impose on Mankind, by a vast confidence in the falsest points; and there is no need of any thing to refute him, but only to give a plain account of the facts which he has taken so much pains to misrepresent and falsify.

Some proofs of this have been already offered, but I shall here produce a new one. Sir *Robert Brooke* was Lord Chief Justice of *England* under Queen *Mary*; he was a hot Roman Catholick, and a zealous maintainer of the party of the old Religion, he was, like most of the Divines of that time, possessed with a notion that the Ordinations made in King *Edward*’s time, were null, because they were not made according to the old Pontifical. Being thus prepossess’d, he was consulted upon the validity of some Leases and Bargains made by the new Bishops, and decided in his work, entitled, *The grand Abridgment*, &c. that they were null, because the persons who made them were not Bishops. This decision is indeed *Brooke*’s, and in this point *Champney* has not been guilty of any

<sup>b</sup> *Judices Regni sub ipsâmet Elizabethâ Reginâ Ordinationes Episcoporum factas sub Edwardo adeo in dubium vocârunt, ut eas nullas fuisse existimâsse vidantur.*

falsehood: But he would fain impose on the world in another particular, viz. in advancing that this decision was made in Queen Elizabeth's time; *Judices regi sub ipsamet Elizabethâ*; whereas, in truth, it was made under Queen Mary, as is easy to prove, 1<sup>st</sup>. Because Brooke was dead before Queen Elizabeth came to the crown. 2<sup>dly</sup>, Because the anonymous author, who hath out of Sir Robert Brooke's work extracted the most considerable cases that happened under Henry the eighth, Edward the sixth, and Queen Mary, mentions particularly in the second year of Queen Mary, the report or case in question, *Anno secundo Mariæ*. This work which is published with the title of *Ascuns Novell. Cases de les ans & temps le Roy H. 8. Ed. 6. & la Roygne Mary, &c.* and it is to be seen in the Library of St. Genevieve, could not but be known to Champney, because he quotes it; so that he must necessarily be guilty of a most scandalous prevarication, in ascribing to the Judges in Queen Elizabeth's time, a decision that was made in Queen Mary's; and in ascribing likewise to Brooke (for making the falsehood he had asserted to pass down the better) a work printed under Queen Elizabeth, which after all is nothing but an extract of a work of his, as appears from the very title, *Ascuns Novell. Cases de les ans & temps le Roy H. 8. Ed. 6. & la Roygne Mary escrie ex la graund Abridgment composed per Sir Robert Brooke Chivaler, &c. la disperse en les titres. Mes icy collecte sub ans.* And indeed as Brooke, who died in 1558, could not possibly print a work in 1587, there needs only settling the true date and time of things to remove the difficulty entirely. Champney's prevarication is so necessary to raise the objection he makes, that the bare discovery of the one leaves not the least pretence in reason for the other; and a distinguishing of the times of facts destroys all the use that could be made of this decision.

Ascuns Novell, Cases, &c. p. 101.

But perhaps it may be still said, that if Sir *Robert Brooke's* Judgment was given under *Queen Mary*, yet it was allowed to be printed with privilege under *Queen Elizabeth*, in the anonymous extract of his work; and that such an allowance could hardly have been obtained, if they did not even then doubt of the validity of those Consecrations. Besides, it is plain that notwithstanding the act of Parliament in 1566, those Consecrations still lay under a good deal of reproach, since many years after the printing of the extract in question, the Parliament 39 *Eliz. i. e.* in 1597<sup>d</sup>, was obliged to pass a new Act to confirm the Ordination of the new Bishops, and the deposition of the old ones: So that there was always a doubt about the validity of those Ordinations; and the prejudice in this point was so strong, that the new Statutes could hardly remove it.

This is the objection, but it is all mere imagination; for this last Statute does not meddle at all with the validity of the Consecration of the new Bishops. It does not so much as say a syllable of it, and the Statutes do not make the least mention of any doubt on this head. The case indeed was this: They had received information that some of the Bishops and other beneficed Persons that were deprived, had drawn up appeals and secret protests against their deprivation, in order to make use of them in a proper season and circumstance, and get redress against a sentence which they had grounds enough to consider as unjust. The Persons who were actually possessed of their places, for fear of some revolution, like what had happen'd formerly, thought it best to provide against these appeals and protests, which gave occasion to that new Act of Parliament, which is printed at length in the *appendix* to this treatise. Now this Statute takes no notice either of the Consecration of the new Bishops, or of any doubt raised on that head; but

<sup>d</sup> *Stat. at large*, tom. 1. p. 921.



only annuls these appeals, and declares that the old Bishops and Deans were lawfully and justly deprived, and that the new ones were lawfully substituted in their room; that the Sees and Deaneries were really void according to Law, and that the deprivation of the one, and possession of the other, was good in Law, and should so remain notwithstanding any appeal or exception to the contrary. This is the tenour of the Statute, and what consequence can be drawn from it, but what is entirely on the side of the new Bishops? Their Ordination is no way concerned in it, and if there is any doubt hinted at in it, it was only on the side of the old ones that were deprived; and it was made only to set aside their appeals, and to declare that all the proceedings in their case were according to Law. How is it then possible to infer from thence, that in Queen *Elizabeth's* time the Judges were still in doubt as to the validity of the Ordinations?

As to the allowance given in her reign for printing the extract of *Brooke's* work with privilege, there cannot be the least stress in nature laid upon it: For it is the constant custom of *England*, when there are in Law-books any precedents or particular cases decided according to the Laws in force at the time of the decision, never to suppress cases of this sort, upon reprinting of those Books, even though those Laws have been since repealed. After such repeal, those Books are only considered as historical works, which shew the practice and sentiments of the times when such Cases were so decided; and the Judges who license the printing of 'em, know very well that the Law is no longer in force, and do not consider so much the time when the work is printed, as the time in which it was wrote: So that there could be no reason for their hindring the impression of this extract of *Sr. Robert Brooke's* work; because if we consider the time when *Sir Robert* gave his judgments, there is no danger at all of being mistaken; and after the solemn declaration of Parliament in 1566, there could be

be no apprehension of any body's ascribing to Queen *Elizabeth* a decision made in Queen *Mary's* time ; so well was the difference of those times known. This allowance therefore is no proof at all, that any ill opinion was in Queen *Elizabeth's* time entertain'd of the new Ordinations ; and *Champney*, by making such a stir about it, hath only furnish'd us with a further proof of his prevarication, in thinking to palm upon the world a decision as made in Queen *Elizabeth's* time, which is directly contrary to the Laws, the Practice, and the Opinions which prevail'd in her reign.

*Champney* perhaps acts more sincerely in the next difficulty that he urges, *viz.* That the Queen was her self of opinion, that the Ordination of the new Bishops was made contrary to the Laws, which had abolish'd King *Edward's* Ordinal, and had not re-establish'd it afterwards, because in the second Commission which she issued out for *Parker's* Consecration, she, to get over this defect, added a clause which she believ'd necessary to prevent any objections being made against the validity of these Ordinations. <sup>e</sup> " Sup-  
 " plying nevertheless (as the Commission runs) by our  
 " Supreme Royal Authority, out of our own free mo-  
 " tion and certain knowledge, all defects whatever,  
 " if there be, or shall be, either in what is to be done  
 " by you pursuant to our aforesaid Mandate, or in  
 " you, or any of you, your condition, state and qua-  
 " lifications for the performance of the Premises, a-  
 " ny thing wanting of what is required in this case,  
 " either by the Statutes of this Realm, or by the ec-  
 " clesiastical Laws, or is necessary thereto, according

<sup>e</sup> Supplentes nichilominus supremâ auctoritate nostrâ Regiâ, ex mero motu & certa scientiâ nostris, siquid aut in hiis quæ, juxta mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fient, aut in vobis, aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate vestris ad præmissa perficienda desit, aut deerit eorum, quæ per statuta hujus Regni, aut per Leges Ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione & rerum necessitate id postulante,  
*Rymer*, Tom. 15. p. 550.

*of the English ORDINATIONS.* 141

“ as the circumstance of time, and exigence of Affairs require.” Now, say they, there is no doubt, but this Clause had a particular respect to the form of Ordination, since the Statute of 1566 takes express notice of it in these Words, <sup>f</sup> “ Moreover, to take away all difficulties that might be started against the confirmations, investitures and consecrations of the said Archbishops and Bishops, her Majesty in her Letters Patents directed to the Archbishop and Bishops for the confirmation, investiture and consecrations of the Bishops elect, not only made use of the forms that her Father and Brother had us’d, but also caus’d a special Clause to be inserted, whereby in vertue of her Royal Prerogative, she dispenses with all defects that might possibly happen in those functions, and removes all the difficulties that might be rais’d against those Ordinations.” Which Statute looks as if they suspected there had been some irregularities in the consecration of the new Bishops; and this irregularity must necessarily arise either from King *Edward’s* Ordinal being unauthorized by Law, or from its not containing every thing essential to Ordination; so that either the Ordination was faulty by a defect as to matter and form, or else for want of authority; and in either case, it cannot stand good.

This is the difficulty alledg’d; but, whatever use they will make of this Clause, ’tis certain no conclusion can be drawn from it, to infer that the consecration of the new Bishops was done against Law, and King *Edward’s* Ordinal not re-establish’d in 1559. For, 1. If they had thought this Clause necessary to supply the irregularity of the Ordination, they would not have omitted it in any of the consecrations that were made before 1566, since King *Edward’s* form was not re-establish’d by Name till that year. Yet of all the Commissions issu’d out for the consecration of Bishops, which *Rymer* has publish’d from 1559 to

<sup>f</sup> *Statutes at large*, Tom. 1. p. 815.



## 142 A DEFENCE of the Validity

1566, not one of them has that clause in it, except *Parker's*. 2. All Mankind is agreed, and the *English* as well as others, in opinion that the Prince can only dispense in the case of human Laws; and that the matter and form of the Sacraments do not admit of any dispensation from him. § Archbishop *Bramhall* asserts this expressly, and declares positively, that if any thing essential to Ordination was wanting, such a clause could not make it valid. 3. By this clause the Queen pretends only to supply what might be possibly wanting in respect of formalities and ceremonies no way essential, as appears sufficiently from the very terms of the clause. *Supplentes nichilominus --- si quid aut in his quæ juxta mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fient, aut in vobis aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate vestris ad præmissa perficienda desit, aut deerit eorum quæ per Statuta hujus Regni, aut per leges Ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione & rerum necessitate id postulante.* Here, we see, she only pretends to supply what might be wanting with regard to the *Laws of the Kingdom*, and the *Ecclesiastical Laws*. But the validity of Ordination doth not properly depend on any thing of such a nature, but on things required by the Holy Scripture, and practis'd by the Apostles, as imposition of hands and prayer, both which were observ'd in the new Ordinal, and which they were very sensible, it was not in Queen *Elizabeth's* power to supply. 4. By the use, or rather by the application made of that clause, it is plain that they never thought she had any regard at all in it, to what might relate to the validity of the Consecration. For of all the Records extant, with regard to *Parker's* Ordination, I do not know one wherein this clause is mention'd, except in those for confirming his election, (which was done on *Saturday* the ninth of *December* by the four Bishops, who consecrated him on the seventeenth following) and for inthroning, which are acts purely civil: But

§ *Bramhall's Works*, Tom. I. p. 453.

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 143

in that of Consecration, which is entirely a spiritual act, there is not a syllable of it. *Bramhall* has published the Record of his Confirmation, and it will be printed entire at the end of this Treatise, to save the trouble of searching for it elsewhere; I shall content my self to transcribe in this place the passage that seems to be most essential. <sup>h</sup> “ We *William*,  
 “ late Bishop of *Bath* and *Wells*, and now elect of  
 “ *Chichester*, &c. empower’d by the Commission of  
 “ the Queen’s Majesty, defender of the Faith, &c. to  
 “ be Commissioners with this clause — and likewise  
 “ this additional one, supplying nevertheless, &c. —  
 “ being specially and lawfully deputed thereto— do,  
 “ in virtue of our Sovereign Lady the Queen’s Supream Authority committed to us in this particular, confirm the aforesaid election, supplying by the  
 “ Supream Royal Authority, delegated to us of the  
 “ said Queen’s own motion and certain knowledge,  
 “ whatever has been defective in this Election.” Now by the use made of the clause here, it seems natural enough to conclude, that as in the first Ordination, they did not observe the usage establish’d in the former reign, they were willing to take their precautions against the reproaches of the *Roman* Catholicks; and therefore in the first legal Commission they took care to insert, that the Queen, by her Prerogative, dispens’d with all defects that might happen by a deviation from the Laws, and the incapacity of Persons.  
 5. I have scarce any manner of doubt, but that their main view in this clause related to the persons of the consecrators. *Barlow*, *Scory* and *Coverdale* had been

<sup>h</sup> Nos *Wilelmus* quondam *Bathoniensis* & *Wellensis* Episcopus, nunc *Cicestrensis* electus, &c. —mediantibus literis Commissionariis Ill. Reginæ fidei Defensatricis, &c. Commissionarii cum hac clausula necnon & hac adjectione, Supplentes nihilominus, &c. specialiter & legitimè deputati—prædictam electionem suprema autoritate dictæ D. N. Reginæ nobis in hac parte commissâ confirmamus, supplentes ex supremâ autoritate Reginâ, ex mero Principis motu & certâ scientiâ nobis delegatâ, quidquid in hac Electione fuerit defectum, *Bramhall*, Tom. I. p. 453.  
 depriv’d

depriv'd in Queen *Mary's* reign, and others put in their places; and tho' they still preserv'd their character of Bishops, yet it might be doubted, whether they could legally do any ecclesiastical Office, unless they had been first canonically restored. But as they were not actually restored at that time, there was a very considerable irregularity in this respect, which they thought to provide against by that clause. For 'tis plain enough, that it was the irregularity in regard of the Persons which they chiefly intended to provide against. *Siquid—aut in vobis aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate ad præmissa perficienda desit.*

What confirms me in this opinion is, that in the first Commission drawn up for *Parker's* Ordination, there was no such clause as this. But when they saw that the *Roman* Catholick Bishops would not engage in the affair, and that every thing depended on the depriv'd Bishops, they found themselves oblig'd to add this clause by way of precaution, to prevent any irregularity there was in the choice of the persons appointed for that function. 6. In short, the clause in question does not say that any thing was defective in the Ordination, nor even suppose it; but only does what is practis'd at *Rome*, when they grant Absolutions, *cautelam*, without enquiring whether they are necessary or no. They are a sort of superabundant precautions, or clauses of form, which are put in to prevent all cavils, and stave off all reproaches, that there is any pretence to make: And, as long as there is no determining exactly, out of what particular motive this clause was inserted in the Commission for *Parker's* Ordination, 'tis impossible to conclude from thence that King *Edward's* Ordinal was not re-establish'd in 1559; because, supposing even that it was re-established, there was always room to insert such a clause in the Commission, on account of other irregularities that might happen in it.



What I have further to add for destroying entirely this objection, is, that even the Statute of 1566 affords no manner of proof against the validity of the Consecration. For, as *Mason*<sup>i</sup> has very well observ'd, that Statute does five things. 1. It censures such as call'd in question the validity of the *English* Ordinations. 2. It recites the Laws upon this subject. 3. It declares that the matters necessary for Ordination were never observ'd with so much exactness as under Queen *Elizabeth*. 4. It confirms *The Common-Prayer Book* again, with the Ordinal annex'd to it. 5. It declares likewise, that all Persons that had been consecrated or ordained by that Ordinal were, and should be, acknowledged as rightly and duly ordain'd. Now from all this there can be nothing drawn any way prejudicial to the validity of the Consecrations; but on the contrary, the Parliament declaring that they had stuck to the necessary points in Ordination more religiously under Queen *Elizabeth*, than under any other Prince, it may well be presum'd that the clause in question was only a matter of mere precaution.

'Tis true indeed, the Statute takes notice, that for preventing any difficulties that might be rais'd against the confirmation, investiture and consecration of the Bishops, the Queen inserted a dispensing clause in her Letters Patents: But the Statute does not so much as hint that any defects relating to the consecration affected its validity; it rather supposes that they did not affect it in the least, because the *English* Divines were of the same opinion with us, that the civil Power can never make an Ordination valid, that was attended with any essential defect; and that tho' the Prince, or Parliament, might declare whether the Ordinations were valid or no, yet they could never make them valid, unless they were so of themselves before.

Vind. Eccles. Angl. lib. 3. cap. 7. p. 332.

## CHAP. IX.

*An answer to the third difficulty. Heretical opinions of those employ'd to draw up the Ordinal for consecration, establish'd by Edward VI. are not sufficient to invalidate the consecrations perform'd according to that Ordinal.*

THE advantage that arises from attempting to invalidate *Parker's* consecration, has brought every thing into play which tends to destroy the authority of the Ordinal us'd in that ceremony. At first it was deny'd that the Ordinal was at all made use of, and this was what produc'd the Fable of the *Nag-head* Ordination in *Cheapside*. In process of time it was asserted in opposition to publick Testimonies, and contrary to the direct Words of the Acts of Parliament, that this Ordinal was at that time contrary to Law. This second objection was as easily answer'd as the former; and at present this debate is reduc'd to so low an ebb, as to maintain that the Ordinal for consecration being drawn up by Prelates infected with heretical Tenets in the very point of consecration, there is room to believe, that the form they drew up, in which their errors are clearly set forth, can never serve to perform a valid consecration. This difficulty one would think should not be of any weight with Divines, since it tends to the rejecting their Baptisms, and their other Sacraments, as well as their Consecrations: However to leave no scruple unsatisfied, I shall consider this point with some attention.

It evidently appears, that *Cranmer*<sup>k</sup> and *Barlow*, two of the Prelates appointed to reform the publick Liturgy and Form of Ordination, were notoriously erroneous in the matter of Orders: To be convinc'd

<sup>k</sup> Burnet's *Hist.* part 2. p. 62.

of this we, need go no further than to examine the questions concerning the Sacraments, which were propos'd to several Prelates, and some Divines, whose opinions were requir'd. The very questions themselves have been publish'd by *Burnet* and *Collier* in their Histories<sup>1</sup>; and it is of some importance, to strengthen the objection made, to give an account of some of them. The twelfth question is, *Whether in the New Testament be requir'd any consecration of a Bishop and Priest, or only appointing to the Office be sufficient?* *Cranmer*, and *Barlow* as well as he, affirm'd that Consecration is not necessary, and that the designation only is sufficient. The thirteenth and fourteenth questions propose, *Whether (if it so fortune a Christian Prince, learned, to conquer certain Dominions of Infidels, having none but temporal learned Men with him) if it be defended by God's Law, that he and they should preach and teach the Word of God there or no? And also make and constitute Priests or no?* *Cranmer*, *Barlow*, and several others affirm'd he might. *Menevensis*, *Thirlebeus* — *etiam potestatem ministrandi sacramenta, & ordinandi ministros concedunt illis*. In their answers to several questions propos'd relating to the number of the Sacraments, Ordination is always excluded; excepting in their answer to the fourth question, where they extend the word Sacrament to many things which are only Figures, or plainly Ceremonies. In the answer to the seventh question *Cranmer* and *Barlow* exclude Ordination particularly from the number of the Sacraments, as carrying no virtual efficacy along with it. In the ninth they say the Apostles only us'd their authority to make Bishops, because there were no Christian Princes in being, whose orders they were bound to obey. In a word, pure Presbyterianism without disguise, discovers it self in all the answers; and it is but too apparent, that the chief aim of these Divines and Prelates, was to extinguish Episcopacy.

<sup>1</sup> *Burnet*, Tom. 1. *Record*, N<sup>o</sup> 21. p. 201. *Collier's Eccles. Hist.* Tom. 2. *Rec.* N<sup>o</sup> 49. p. 40.



## 148 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

*Cranmer* imbib'd these opinions from his commerce with the *Lutheran Churches*, with whom he had contracted a strict intimacy during his stay in *Germany*, when he was employ'd there in the affairs of *Henry the eighth*; and after his return, he communicated them to several others, of which number *Barlow* was without doubt one of the first; since in 1536, among many other errors, which he was accus'd of spreading, he was charg'd with having maintain'd this proposition:  
<sup>m</sup> *That if the King's Grace, being supreme head of the Church of England, did chuse, denominate, and elect any layman (being learned) to be a Bishop; that he so chosen (without mention made of any Orders) should be as good a Bishop as he is, or the best in England.* The most obstinate Presbyterian never carried the no-necessity of Ordination further; and can it be imagin'd that an Ordinal, drawn up by Men of such Principles, can contain the requisites of Ordination?

In short, supposing, as it appears certain, that *Cranmer*, and those who assisted him, were of the same opinion with the *Calvinists* and *Lutherans*, with respect to the hierarchy of the Church and the necessity of Ordination, it is to be believ'd that episcopal Ordination was preserv'd only for forms sake; and since they look upon this dignity but as a civil employment, the administration of which was independent of the Ceremonies by which it was confer'd, as they explain themselves in the answer to the ninth question<sup>n</sup>; it is impossible that they ever thought of asserting the validity of Ordination in a Catholick Sense; and consequently, this Ordinal is evidently defective and null. This appears to me what can be said of most weight in order to inforce the objection; I proceed to remove it.

There are two things requisite to do this effectually: The *first* is to examine whether the supposition as it is set forth in the objection be true. *Secondly*, Whe-

<sup>m</sup> Collier's *Hist.* Tom. 2. p. 135.  
<sup>n</sup> *Res.* I. p. 220.

<sup>n</sup> Burnet's *Hist.* Tom.

ther, allowing it to be so, that the consequence drawn from it be right. I begin with the truth of the supposition.

It is first suppos'd that the Ordinal was drawn up by Prelates pre-possess'd with heretical Tenets, in the very point of Ordination; that is to say, who had imbib'd the sentiments, or rather the errors of the Presbyterians, as *Cranmer* and *Barlow*. But the fact is otherwise than it is related: For, if in the Committee nominated to reform the Liturgy, there were some Prelates, or some Divines, that held these errors; yet it must be allow'd, that the majority were of a contrary opinion. In short, according to <sup>o</sup> *Burnet* and *Collier*, this Committee was compos'd of the Archbishops of *Canterbury* and *York*; the Bishops of *Lincoln*, *Durham*, *Worcester*, *Norwich*, *St. Asaph*, *Salisbury*, *Coventry*, *Carlisle*, *Bristol*, *St. Davids*, *Ely*, *Lincoln*, *Chichester*, *Hereford*, *Westminster*, and *Rochester*: And of Doctors, *Cox*, *May*, *Taylor*, *Haynes*, *Robertson* and *Redmayn*. And according to <sup>p</sup> *Heylin* these same Bishops employ'd in the reformation of the Liturgy, were also employ'd to reform the Ordinal. Now it appears by the answers made to the questions above mention'd, that the majority of the Prelates and Divines, were of opposite sentiments to those of *Cranmer*.

As for instance, <sup>q</sup> upon the seventh question, except *Cranmer* and *Barlow*, almost all agree upon the efficacy of the Sacraments. *Conveniunt omnes præter Menevensem naturam septem Sacramentorum nobis tradi in Scripturis. Eboracensis effectus singulorum enumerat, item Carliolensis.* Upon the ninth question, viz. *Whether the Apostles lacking a higher Power, as in not having a Christian King among them, made Bishops by that necessity, or by authority given by God?* They all agreed that *Christ* had given this power to his Apostles: Om-

<sup>o</sup> *Burnet's Hist.* Tom. 2. p. 61. *Collier's History*, Tom. 2. p. 243. <sup>p</sup> *Heylin's Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 82. <sup>q</sup> *Burnet*, Tom. 1. Records, p. 217.

nes conveniunt Apostolos divinitus accepisse potestatem creandi Episcopos; and I do not find that any one fell into Cranmer's error, who was of opinion that there was no necessity for any further Ceremonies to make a Bishop, than there was for any other lay Magistrate; and that the Rites made use of were out of decency, and not out of necessity. Upon the eleventh question, *Whether a Bishop hath authority to make a Priest by the Scripture or no?* And, *Whether any other but a Bishop only may make a Priest?* All excepting Barlow Bishop of St. Davids, were of opinion that Bishops had the said Power. *Convenit omnibus prater Menevensem, Episcopos habere auctoritatem instituendi Presbyteros;* and almost all agree that they alone have this Power. *Eboracensis videtur omnino denegare alii hanc potestatem.* Redmaynus, Symmons, Robertsonus, Leightonus, Thirlby, Correnus, Rossensis, Edgworthus, Oglethorpus, Carliolensis nusquam legerunt alios usos fuisse hac potestate. To the twelfth query, which regards the necessity of Ordination, almost all were of a contrary opinion to Cranmer and Barlow, and did acknowledge the necessity of consecration. *Respondent Eboracensis, Londinensis, Carliolensis, Leighton, Tresham, Robertsonus, &c. consecrationem esse requisitam.* Redmanus ait eam receptam esse ab Apostolis, atque à Spiritu Sancto institutam ad conferendam gratiam. Dayus, Rossensis, Symmons aiunt Sacerdotium conferri per manuum impositionem, idque è Scripturis; consecrationem vero diu receptam in Ecclesia. Coxus institutionem cum manuum impositione sufficere, neque per Scripturam requiri consecrationem, &c. To the fourteenth, *Whether it be forefended by God's Law, that (if it so fortune that all the Bishops and Priests of a Region were dead, and that the Word of God should remain there unpreach'd, and the Sacrament of Baptism, and others, unministred) the King should make Bishops, &c.* Few were of Cranmer's opinion. *Fateretur, ut prius, omnes Laicos posse docere.* Eboracensis, Symmons, Oglethorp negant posse ordinare Presbyteros; tamen concedit Eboracensis baptizare, & contrahere matrimonia;



## of the English ORDINATIONS. 151

monia; *Edgworth tantum baptizare posse; nam sufficere dicit ad salutem, &c.* These opposite sentiments of the majority of the Prelates and Divines, to those of *Cranmer*, make it plain enough that the reformation of the Liturgy was not blindly abandon'd to the views and erroneous opinions of this Archbishop, and that the preservation of the hierarchy in the Church was none of his work.

And if one may judge of what pass'd in this affair, by that of the six Articles, so far was *Cranmer's* opinion from being blindly follow'd without consideration, that on the contrary, it is to be believ'd that he was intirely worsted: For in the affair of the six Articles, being of a different opinion from the Archbishop of *York* and the other Bishops, the Bill<sup>r</sup> they drew up was prefer'd to one which he had propos'd; and he had the mortification to see these Articles approv'd in Parliament, and that publickly by the Prince's authority, in spite of the opposition which he had made, and of all the credit which he had with the King.

Besides, it would seem as if one of the chief views of this Committee was so to moderate matters between the Catholicks and the Protestants, as to satisfy alike both parties in composing the new Liturgy, and in reforming the Ordinal. *Collier* in his History lets us into this circumstance, "the Committee, says he, " compos'd of Bishops and Divines, mov'd gently " in the reformation. They were willing to satisfy " the Court and the Act of Parliament, and at the " same time find out such a temper as might not be " shocking to those of the old persuasion." With this spirit the Liturgy was compos'd, and they were guided by the same spirit in composing the form of Ordination; and this disposition sway'd them in their reformation of the administration of the Sacraments. They retrench'd what they judg'd most novel and

<sup>r</sup> Burnet's Hist. Tom. 1. p. 258.  
Tom. 2. p. 245.

<sup>c</sup> Collier's Eccl. Hist.

useless, and at the same time preserv'd what they look'd upon as most antient and most properly belonging to their very being. By what they retrench'd they carried on the project of the reformation, and by what they preserv'd they remedied or rather prevented a disunion from the Catholicks, whom they absolutely desired to keep with them, by making as little change as possible in every thing relating to the publick service. Queen *Elizabeth* carry'd these views still further, and this is what has preserv'd the hierarchy in *England*, as well as some exterior Ceremonies, which makes that Church to be look'd upon by other Protestants, as still within the confines of Popery and Superstition.

It is therefore not true (as it was suppos'd) that those employ'd to reform the Liturgy were Presbyterians in their Principles, or that they only preserv'd episcopal Ordination for forms sake, or that they look'd upon Consecration to be useless. The errors of some cannot without injustice be imputed to the whole; and at the very time when the charms of novelty increas'd the number of the Innovators, a great many Divines, and a good part of the Clergy, remain'd firm in the defence of the Hierarchy; and there has not been found in any Church more zealous defenders of Episcopacy, than have appear'd in the Church of *England* since the Schism.

If *Burnet* is to be credited, *Cranmer* himself did not persist in his errors, in relation to ecclesiastical Ordinations. For, 'tho' " in *Cranmer's* Paper, some " singular opinions of his about the nature of ecclesi- " astical Offices will be found; but as they are de- " liver'd by him with all possible modesty, so they " were not establish'd as the doctrine of the Church, " but laid aside as particular conceits of his own; " and it seems that afterwards he chang'd his opini- " on; for he subscrib'd the Book that was soon after " set out, which is directly contrary to those opini-

† *Hist. of the Reformation*, Tom. i. p. 289.

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 153

“ons set down in these Papers”. And in short, he was so little steady in his errors upon this head, that in some writings found among his Papers, and printed in *Burnet's History*, he acknowledges Ordination for a Sacrament, to which Grace is annex'd<sup>u</sup>, and whereby the Church furnishes it self with *Ministers* who succeed to one another, and to whom authority is conveyed by prayer and imposition of hands, instituted by Christ and his Apostles. The supposition therefore made is very doubtful, with regard to the errors of those employ'd to reform the Ordinal.

But for argument sake, let the supposition be granted in its full extent: The question will then be, whether the validity, or invalidity of an Ordinal, which is otherwise suppos'd to retain, and preserve all that is essential to a Sacrament, depends upon the private opinions of those who drew it up? Which is the same with saying, that if it had been drawn up by Catholics, it had been valid; but as it was drawn by Hereticks it is no more so. Now this is exactly the case, since it has been prov'd above, that the *English* Ordinal is essentially the same with the *Roman* Pontifical, and that all the fundamental Rites are preserv'd in it, that is to say prayer and imposition of hands, which were alone esteem'd necessary by the ancients, as I have already prov'd. Therefore in this case what I assert is, that the opinions of Divines have not the least influence upon the validity or invalidity of the form, which, as it appears, may be made out by theological reasons, and by facts whose analogy may clearly demonstrate that the *English* Ordinations are to be treated upon no worse bottom, than that of other Sacraments administred by Hereticks.

The first reason receiv'd at this day almost generally in the Schools is, that the inward intention of the Priest contributes in nothing to the validity or invalidity of a Sacrament. All that is requir'd is, to

<sup>u</sup> Tom. i. Collec. p. 323.



do as the Church does, and that is perform'd when all the essential parts of a rite prescrib'd by her is comply'd with, which is *per modum Religiosæ ceremoniæ*, as the Schools express it. Now all this is observed in our case, all is observ'd that is essential to Ordination; as for instance, the imposition of hands, prayer, or invocation of the Holy Ghost, has been preserv'd, the Ordinations have been perform'd in a religious manner; that is to say, according to the Laws in force, and with a view to establish Ministers in the Church of *England*, who were wanting. It must be allow'd, that the private intention of those who either drew up the new Ritual, or of them who confer'd Orders according to it, may in some sense corrupt or alter the intention of the Church, but it cannot utterly destroy it: For example, in the administration of Baptism, the errors of the *Arians* might perhaps corrupt the intention of the Church, but their Baptism was not esteem'd the less valid, the essential parts of the office being observ'd.

A second reason, and it is what the Church founds her opinion upon in prohibiting the repetition of Sacraments which stamp a character, is that the intention not being made manifest, the outward behaviour can only be judg'd of. It matters not whether the Bishop or Priest privately makes a jest of the Sacraments which he administers, it is no matter if he believes them to want force and virtue; his own thoughts neither make them valid or invalid. It is the execution of our Saviour's commands, and a compliance with the essential parts of a rite practis'd in the church, which renders a consecration effective, or, if you please, imprints a character. It is therefore by these marks alone, and not by the private opinions of those who drew up the Ordinals, or confer'd Orders, that the validity of a Sacrament is to be judg'd of, and every other mark is doubtful. In the composition of the new Ordinal, there is nothing whereby it appears that the authors of it had any private view to-  
wards

*of the English ORDINATIONS.* 155

wards abolishing Episcopacy, or to establish the necessity of Consecration, or to reduce all things to the Presbyterian way of Church-Government. On the contrary, the manner of composing the new ritual, destroys all these views; the two orders of Priesthood and Episcopacy, are carefully distinguished, and the pre-eminency and prerogatives which raise the latter above the former, are very well preserv'd; every part of them declare the necessity of the Ordination both of Bishops and Priests. And this Ritual on the other side is supported by national Laws, which declare Consecration indispensable. In a word, whatever may have been the opinions, or rather the errors of some of those who corrected this Ritual upon this subject, yet since nothing contrary to the catholick tenets are set forth in it, no advantage can be drawn from their opinions and errors to invalidate the Ordinal made use of in the administration of their Orders.

A third reason which serves to prove the validity of the Ordinal, and that it does not depend upon the erroneous opinions maintained by those who compos'd it, is that by supposing, as it was in truth, that the changes made did not take away from the substance of the form; that is to say, the essence of the prayers which compose the Ordinal, then it is still to be looked upon as the work of the Church, and in some sort to intend to do the same as the Church intends, notwithstanding the changes and alterations introduced in the ceremonial part. Now this is the present case. The essence of the prayer which constitutes the form of Ordination, as was shewn in the sixth Chapter, consists in the invocation of the Holy Ghost, to obtain for the Bishop elect the Grace necessary to fulfill with holiness the duties of his ministry. The remainder is but accessory, and may either be omitted or alter'd, without the Sacrament's losing any of its virtue. Now in King *Edward's* Ordinal, the whole substance of this prayer has been preserv'd. God Almighty

mighty is pray'd to, to fill the Bishop elect with his Holy Spirit, which is invoked to descend upon him. The imposition of hands join'd to the form, *Take the Holy Ghost*, is another kind of invocation, which declares the effect of what God Almighty is prayed to grant. In fine, the whole ceremony in general is but a continuation of prayers, in which the Church begs of God Almighty to influence a Minister worthy of him, to animate him with his Spirit, to enlighten him with his knowledge, to fill him with his strength, to give him Grace to attend his flock with success, and to be faithful in all his duties.

These reasons are supported by facts, and by the example of the ancient church. It does not appear that the validity or the invalidity of Sacraments, should be determin'd by the opinions of those who drew up the forms whereby they were convey'd, and regard was only had to the substance of the form, and to the manner how it was express'd.

It is known to every body, that there were no small difficulties in relation to the Baptism of the *Arians*, not only as to those who rejected all Baptism administer'd by Hereticks, but also by those who admitted it, by reason of the particular errors which the *Arians* had introduc'd into the very administration of this Sacrament; nevertheless the essence of the form being preserv'd; that is to say, the invocation of the holy Trinity, their Baptism was allow'd of as well as that of other Hereticks: and the council of *Nice* rais'd no objections to their prejudice; yet it must be allow'd there was room to make them, if the intention of the Minister could hinder the Sacrament from having its effect; why then will they have the private errors ascrib'd to *Cranmer* and *Barlow*, do any more prejudice to the validity of Ordination, since all that was essential is preserv'd, as it has been already proved; and that in this respect they are not in a worse condition than the *Arians*?



*of the* English ORDINATIONS. 157

Among even the Reform'd themselves, how many are there who attribute no efficacy to Baptism, and who only look on that Sacrament as an initiation to Christianity? But was it ever believed that this error ought to make the administration of that Sacrament to be look'd upon as null? And was the rebaptizing of Converts from them ever thought of?

What has been said of Baptism may be said of all the Sacraments; of the Eucharist, of Penance, of Confirmation, &c. There are none of these Sacraments in which there have not been numbers of errors among the ancient and modern Hereticks; and there are few who have not alter'd many things in the administration of these Sacraments: But for all that, was it ever believ'd that these Sacraments were null, or that the particular errors of those who introduc'd these changes, either in the belief of the Church or in the exercise of its worship, took away from the Sacraments there efficacy and virtue?

It may be said, the principle is granted, but that in this case the application is not just: That it is true, the Ministers errors cannot take any thing away of virtue from the Sacraments, and that a light change in the ceremonies employ'd in their administration, cannot in any thing diminish their force: But here it is not barely so, here is not only a change in the rite, but an intire change of the form; and that the person who administers the Sacrament in the name of the Church, is not only himself in an error, but that this Ordinal was drawn up in direct opposition to that used by the Church, and by Men, who having rais'd their Standard against the Church, are no more deem'd to act in her name; that nothing parallel is seen in the Sacraments whose validity hath been acknowledg'd, and that antiquity furnishes no example which can be apply'd to authorize the validity of the *English* Ordinations.

This objection has something in it that is dazzling, but nothing solid at bottom, and is moreover refuted before.

before. It has been demonstrated that the change which happen'd in the form of Ordination, has nothing essential in it, and does not touch upon the substance of it. It is therefore not true, that here is more than a change in the rite only, and that the change introduc'd, must make the new Ordinal to be look'd upon as a new form. Again, a change of this nature made even with a design to introduce an error, does not render a Sacrament invalid, according to Father Alexander<sup>a</sup>, *Si adjungeret---verba non quasi partem formæ sacramentalis esse vellet, sed ut errorem suum indicaret, aut alios in eandem hæresim pertraheret, vera esset ac rata consecratio, modò intenderet facere quod facit Ecclesia*. In short, if the invocation of the holy Trinity in Baptism was wrap'd up in prayers made for the administration of this Sacrament, would it be judg'd that this new disposition of the invocation, made a new form of Baptism? The case before us is the same: The invocation of the Holy Ghost is always the form of Ordination, and the change is only in some words. It is not, as it is supposed, intended as an opposite form to that of the Church, but on the contrary, to restore as much as possible the simplicity the Church formerly practis'd in the dispensation of its Sacraments. This is evident from the declaration made by the Prelates and Divines who were deputed for this work; that in the reformation of this part of the Liturgy, they had made the canons of the council of *Carthage* y the rule to go by. Will it be said that that council could not be a rule to a national Church to draw up its form of Ordination by? The thing refutes itself, and the example of the Church of *Africa* is a convincing argument that any other Church may regulate her own Liturgy and Worship.

If it be objected, that a consequence cannot be drawn from the Church of *Africa*, because that Church

\* Theolog. dogm. & Mor. l. 2. cap. 3. Reg. 6. y Heylin's *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 83.

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 159

was catholick, and this regards, as to us, an heretical Church. I agree that in some respects one cannot conclude from the one to the other; but what I conclude is, that since the Church of *England* has made the canons of the council of *Carthage* its rule in her Ordinations, they did not pretend to oppose their form to that of the catholick Church; but on the contrary, to restore the said form to its ancient simplicity, and preserve to Episcopacy the distinction and pre-eminence it always had in the Church. And *Calvin* was so shock'd at it, that he could not forbear shewing his indignation in several of his letters, and looked upon the government of the Church of *England* as the remains of Popery, that ought to be abolish'd. This is evident by one of his letters to *Cranmer*, wherein he explains himself in these terms; “ Ex-  
“ ternal superstitions are so reform'd, that there re-  
“ main innumerable branches, which continually  
“ sprout forth. Truly I hear that there are such an  
“ heap of papal corruptions left, that they not only  
“ obscure, but almost stifle the pure and genuine  
“ worship of God——Certainly religion will never  
“ flourish untill better care is taken of the Churches,  
“ so that they have fit Pastors, who will in good ear-  
“ nest attend to the office of instructing-- —Another  
“ evil appears to me of no less weight, that *Slowbel-*  
“ *lies* are nourished out of the publick revenues of the  
“ Church, who chant Vespers in an unknown tongue.

² Sic correctæ sunt externæ superstitiones, ut residui maneant innumeri furculi, qui assidue pullulent. Imò ex corruptelis Papatûs audio relictam esse congeriem, quæ non obscurat modò, sed propemodùm obruat purum & genuinum Dei cultum— Certè nunquam integra florebit religio, donec Ecclesiis melius prospectum fuerit, ut idoneos habeant pastores, & qui docendi munus seriò obeant——Non multo levius mihi videtur aliud vitium, quod ex publico Ecclesiæ proventu aluntur otiosi ventres, qui linguâ incognitâ Vesperas cantillent. Nihil dico amplius, nisi quod te approbatorem esse ejus ludibrii, quod palam cum legitimo Ecclesiæ ordine pugnat, plusquam absurdum est. Calv. Ep. p. 62. Edit. 1667.

I say



“ I say no more, only that you are a Patron of this  
 “ conduct, which is most absurd, being directly op-  
 “ posite to the rightful orders of the Church.” How-  
 ever inclin’d *Cranmer* might have been to the disci-  
 pline of *Geneva* in all its parts, this shews he was not of  
 the strongest side, but that he had been forced to follow  
 the governing party, which was for episcopacy, and  
 that the form had been drawn up less to his view,  
 than to those of the Divines who oppos’d him, or  
 even that he had at that time chang’d his sentiments,  
 as *Burnet* agrees he had.

When it is further said that the Prelates and Di-  
 vines who drew up the new Ordinal, are not to be  
 deem’d as acting in the name of the Church, because  
 they had declared war against her: This reproach is  
 not particular to the *English*, it bears generally upon  
 all those who have separated themselves from the  
 Church by heresy or schism; and if the same reason  
 has not invalidated all the Sacraments from being al-  
 low’d which they administer’d, preserving the matter  
 and the essential form, the same justice ought to be  
 allow’d the *English*, who, notwithstanding their schism,  
 have preserv’d all the essential parts of Ordination.

In fine, it is not true that antiquity does not fur-  
 nish instances to authorize the validity of the *English*  
 Ordinations. What shall be urged in the following  
 Chapter of the power of a national Church in matters  
 of discipline, and of the different practices of several  
 Sects, will make it appear unanswerable, that exam-  
 ples as well as reason, make out the right of the  
 Church of *England* to compose for herself a different  
 Liturgy for publick Worship, and that the validity of  
 her Ordinations ought to be allow’d of, as those  
 were, for the most part, of other Sects, notwith-  
 standing the changes made in their Rituals and Pon-  
 tificals.

CHAP. X.

*An inquiry into the Power of a national Church in the administration of the Sacraments; and whether by the changes she makes in the form of their administration they lose their validity, when even the alterations were not made untill after her falling into Schism or Heresy.*

WE have seen in the preceding Chapters that nothing is wanting as to the validity of the *English* Ordinations, both with respect to the matter and the form, and that whatever change was made in the Prayers, which compose the form of Ordination, this change does not in the least affect the substance of it; and that in this the Church of *England* has done nothing more than what all other Churches have done before her. That the alteration made does not at all affect the substance of the forms of Ordination, is what was demonstrated by comparing the *Roman* Pontifical with *King Edward's* Ritual. It remains now to prove, that the Church of *England*, in making those changes which she did, has done no more than what other Churches had practis'd, and therefore nothing from hence can be concluded against the validity of the *English* Ordinations.

To prove this, it will be sufficient to shew what the practice in general was; for in sound divinity, a practice founded in reason, becomes a compleat proof to authorize other facts. Now the practice is evident, and nothing is so easily evinc'd. I do not speak here of a simple change in the matter of arbitrary ceremonies, which vary in every Church at the will of the Pastors; every body does agree that particular Churches have a power to alter what they think necessary, if they do not thereby prejudice the subordination

nation they owe each other, nor disturb by any indif-  
 creet alterations the common peace, and the unifor-  
 mity of publick worship, which prudence and cha-  
 rity tells her that she ought to preserve as much as it  
 lies in her power to do. I also say that in the admi-  
 nistration of the Sacraments, particular Churches have  
 practis'd this power, and M. l'Abbe Renaudot himself  
 acknowledges it, speaking of the Syriac Liturgies in  
 the preface before the second volume of the oriental  
 Liturgies; *a Igitur ex episcopali auctoritate*, says he, *qua*  
*Orientalis Antistites usi sunt, in ordinandis ecclesiasticis*  
*officiis, ut Baptismi administrandi formulas, Ritualesque*  
*libros, cum adjunctis precibus, coronationis seu benedictionis*  
*nuptialis, absolutionis pœnitentium, & alia non pauca, ita*  
*quoque Liturgias scripserunt.* One sees that he speaks  
 here of the forms of Matrimony, of Penance, &c. and  
 nothing is more easily proved than this.

Of the number of the Sacraments recogniz'd as  
 such by the catholick Church, there are some, both as  
 to matter and form, determin'd by Christ himself;  
 and there are others which are left to be determin'd  
 by the Church. Baptism and the Eucharist are of the  
 first kind, the other Sacraments are of the second,  
 especially as to the form; and Ordination is of this  
 number. Now upon the whole, as to these latter,  
 and perhaps the same may be said of the former, par-  
 ticular Churches believ'd they had a right to draw up  
 their forms according to their own taste, without  
 strictly adhering to the same form of words, only pre-  
 serving the substance and spirit of the Prayers which  
 related to the essence of the Sacrament. This practice  
 is not to be doubted of, a few instances will prove  
 it.

The form of the Sacrament of Penance consists, as  
 Divines maintain, in the words of the absolution.  
 Now these words have been chang'd according to the  
 times, and the usage of Churches. If one consults

<sup>a</sup> Dissert. de Syriac. Liturg. p. 13.



of the English ORDINATIONS. 163

the different forms publish'd by Father *Morin*, and Father *Martin*, he will find none of them agree exactly together, in the manner of expression. And to begin with a comparison of the *Greek Church* with the *Latin*, one finds that the indicative form in the office, is not the same with that in our Pontificals; and that among the different offices, there is the same difference found as there is among them and our *Roman* offices.

In the work which Father *Morin* has publish'd upon the Sacrament of Penance, there is a little work publish'd of *Gabriel's* of *Philadelphia*, which makes the form of the Sacrament of Penance to consist in these words; <sup>b</sup> *The Grace of the Holy Spirit, by my humility, has pardon'd and absolv'd thee.* Nevertheless this Formula is quite different from those that are found in the *Euchologies* publish'd by the same author: For the form of that taken out of the *Barbarin Library*, consists properly of three prayers which are found before the question which is ask'd the Penitent; and that which is there the substance of the absolution, cannot be said to be the same form with the preceding one, as to the manner of expression. I affirm therefore that there is less difference between the form of Ordination in the *Roman Pontifical*, and that of King *Edward's Ritual*, than there is between these forms of absolution which we are now a speaking of.

The *Euchology* of *John the Monk* is very different from that of the *Barbarin Library*. The prayer which stands for the form in the first, and which begins with these words, *Deus qui propter nos, homo factus es, &c.* is not at all to be met with in the other, so that it is not to be look'd upon as the same form, only with regard to the substance. The office of *John the younger*, publish'd also by *Morinus*, is different from all these in this, that besides the prayers that are in the

<sup>b</sup> Gratia SS. Spiritus per meam humilitatem, habet te condonatum & absolutum. *Morinus de Sacr. Pœnit. App. p. 146.*

nation they owe each other, nor disturb by any indif-  
 creet alterations the common peace, and the unifor-  
 mity of publick worship, which prudence and cha-  
 rity tells her that she ought to preserve as much as it  
 lies in her power to do. I also say that in the admi-  
 nistration of the Sacraments, particular Churches have  
 practised this power, and M. l'Abbe Renaudot himself  
 acknowledges it, speaking of the Syriac Liturgies in  
 the preface before the second volume of the oriental  
 Liturgies; *a Igitur ex episcopali auctoritate*, says he, *qua  
 Orientales Antistites usi sunt, in ordinandis ecclesiasticis  
 officiis, ut Baptismi administrandi formulas, Ritualesque  
 libros, cum adjunctis precibus, coronationis seu benedictionis  
 nuptialis, absolutionis pœnitentium, & alia non pauca, ita  
 quoque Liturgias scripserunt.* One sees that he speaks  
 here of the forms of Matrimony, of Penance, &c. and  
 nothing is more easily proved than this.

Of the number of the Sacraments recogniz'd as  
 such by the catholick Church, there are some, both as  
 to matter and form, determin'd by Christ himself;  
 and there are others which are left to be determin'd  
 by the Church. Baptism and the Eucharist are of the  
 first kind, the other Sacraments are of the second,  
 especially as to the form; and Ordination is of this  
 number. Now upon the whole, as to these latter,  
 and perhaps the same may be said of the former, par-  
 ticular Churches believ'd they had a right to draw up  
 their forms according to their own taste, without  
 strictly adhering to the same form of words, only pre-  
 serving the substance and spirit of the Prayers which  
 related to the essence of the Sacrament. This practice  
 is not to be doubted of, a few instances will prove  
 it.

The form of the Sacrament of Penance consists, as  
 Divines maintain, in the words of the absolution.  
 Now these words have been chang'd according to the  
 times, and the usage of Churches. If one consults

<sup>a</sup> Dissert. de Syriac. Liturg. p. 13.

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 163

the different forms publish'd by Father *Morin*, and Father *Martin*, he will find none of them agree exactly together, in the manner of expression. And to begin with a comparison of the *Greek Church* with the *Latin*, one finds that the indicative form in the office, is not the same with that in our Pontificals; and that among the different offices, there is the same difference found as there is among them and our *Roman* offices.

In the work which Father *Morin* has publish'd upon the Sacrament of Penance, there is a little work publish'd of *Gabriel's* of *Philadelphia*, which makes the form of the Sacrament of Penance to consist in these words; <sup>b</sup> *The Grace of the Holy Spirit, by my humility, has pardon'd and absolv'd thee.* Nevertheless this Formula is quite different from those that are found in the *Euchologies* publish'd by the same author: For the form of that taken out of the *Barbarin Library*, consists properly of three prayers which are found before the question which is ask'd the Penitent; and that which is there the substance of the absolution, cannot be said to be the same form with the preceding one, as to the manner of expression. I affirm therefore that there is less difference between the form of Ordination in the *Roman Pontifical*, and that of King *Edward's Ritual*, than there is between these forms of absolution which we are now a speaking of.

The *Euchology* of *John the Monk* is very different from that of the *Barbarin Library*. The prayer which stands for the form in the first, and which begins with these words, *Deus qui propter nos, homo factus es, &c.* is not at all to be met with in the other, so that it is not to be look'd upon as the same form, only with regard to the substance. The office of *John the younger*, publish'd also by *Morinus*, is different from all these in this, that besides the prayers that are in the

<sup>b</sup> Gratia SS. Spiritus per meam humilitatem, habet te condonatum & absolutum. *Morinus de Sac. Pœnit. App. p. 146.*



others, this contains several that are not in them; and I am persuaded that this is the most modern of them all. But be it how it will, if all these that are found constitute the form of a Sacrament, each Church has therefore a power to make her own form; and if each of these singly be sufficient, regard is therefore only to be had to the substance, without any manner of concern whether the expressions are the same or no.

But if there was so little uniformity in the forms of absolution used by the *Greek Church*, there is yet less between them and those used by the *Latins*. The form which we now use, is certainly very different from all others as to the manner of expression; and it is astonishing to observe how little conformity there is between this and those of the *Greeks*, or with the old *Latin* offices. It cannot be maintained that particular Churches have no power to regulate their offices, seeing there is no other way to account for this variety, but by the power which Churches have to determine in these cases.

Perhaps it will be said, that the variety found in the forms of Penance that are publish'd, arises only from this, that they are so many forms of publick Penance; and seeing this practice, is not the Sacrament it self but only a part of the exterior discipline that accompanies it, this variety of forms is not at all surprising. But this apology is a weak Subterfuge which is not founded upon any solid reason; for an absolution given either publicly or privately, is still a Sacrament. It is true, that there is a sort of publick absolution, which, properly speaking, is no more than a relaxation of a censure or of an interdict; but there is no affinity between this and the ancient offices of Penance, where there is no question but of the absolution of Sins, which, whether administer'd publicly or secretly, is still a Sacrament; and a Sacrament would not admit of so much variety in its forms, if this variety was not caus'd by the power exercis'd by particular Churches, and if they ever imagin'd that

the substance of the Sacrament could be alter'd. A proof of this is to be found in her offices, where one may see as well by the confession of the Penitents, as by the questions ask'd them, that the office relates to the ordinary confession of Sins. If a Man consults Father *Martin's* collection of offices <sup>c</sup>, viz. third, tenth, and eighteenth, and several others, it will evidently appear that they relate to the absolution of Sins, and not at all to censures; and that nevertheless the Orai-sons and Prayers that are design'd for the absolution, are very different in a great number of those several offices, and are not uniform but in what concerns the substance. That I may not swell up this Chapter unnecessarily, I am oblig'd to refer my reader to Father *Martin's* collection, and to that which Father *Morin* has annex'd to his treatise of Penance, which are in every body's hands.

But there is another yet stronger proof than that which appears in the offices of this same Sacrament of Penance, not relating to the remission of censures; and that is, that the same variety met with in the forms of Penance, is also found in those of other Sacraments. Thus in the prayer annex'd to the unctions in the Sacrament of extreme unction, which Divines say makes the form; for a proof of which, they produce that passage of St. *James's* <sup>d</sup>, *And the prayer of faith shall save the sick*. Now how much have these prayers varied according to the different usages of Churches, and the circumstances of different times? Doctor *Launoy*, in his excellent treatise of extreme unction, and Father *Martin* in his book of ecclesiastical rites, furnish us with sufficient proofs, without being obliged to go and search any further for them.

It appears before, by comparing the *Euchologium* with our *Latin* offices, that the prayer which is join'd to the unctions, is altogether different. According

<sup>c</sup> De Antiq. Eccles. Rit. tom. 2. cap. 6. art. 7.

<sup>d</sup> *James*

to Goar <sup>e</sup>, who in this follows *Arcudius*, and some other *Greek* Divines. The form of extreme unction among the *Greeks* consists in this prayer which accompanies the unction, *Pater sancte, animarum & corporum Medice* <sup>f</sup>, &c. Now there is nothing in our ancient *Latin* offices that exactly answers to this prayer, where there is no mention made of the unction. It is highly probable that we should find not much more uniformity among the rest of the oriental Churches, if the rites they used in the administration of this Sacrament were publish'd. But since these are wanting, let us see if there be more uniformity among the *Latins*.

Our Divines presume that the form of extreme unction consists in these words, *Per istam sanctam unctionem*, &c. which is now us'd; or else in this absolute form more in use formerly, *Ungo te de oleo sancto*, &c. Nevertheless how many offices do we find that want these different forms! In *St. Gregory's* Sacramentary, one finds the prayers that accompany the administration of this Sacrament, but we neither see the preceding forms, nor any mention made of unction in the prayers, as it appears in *M. Launoy's* treatise, from the prayers made use of before the interpolation of that Sacramentary. On the contrary, in several of the offices publish'd by *M. Martin*, these prayers are left to the will of the Minister, as a thing not at all belonging to the essence of the Sacrament.

The same Father *Martin* <sup>g</sup> has publish'd an office according to the use of *St. Germain des Prez*, taken out of the Sacramentary of *St. Gregory*, wherein there is express mention made of the unction; nevertheless the prayer annex'd to it, has not the least affinity with the preceding forms. In the ninth office, taken out of the Monastery of *Moissac* <sup>h</sup>, the forms are yet more different, and in nothing but the substance are the same.

<sup>e</sup> Euchol. p. 437.  
Ritibus Eccl. Ord. 6. tom. 2. p. 129.

<sup>f</sup> Martene, p. 248.

<sup>g</sup> De antiq.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. p. 146.



of the English ORDINATIONS. 167

I do not mention here any thing of the difference that there is between the indicative and deprecatory forms, and again less of the variety found in the choice and number of the prayers annex'd to the forms that accompany the unction. Nevertheless these ought to be considered in the opinion of the most judicious Divines, who do not place the form of a Sacrament in any words preferable to and exclusive of the other prayers that are a part of the rite prescrib'd by the Church: For in that case, as the variety is very great, this would again be a very convincing demonstration of the power of particular Churches to determine as to the forms, wherein the variations would be so visible.

But, abstractedly from this opinion, which appears to me to be very true and very reasonable, that which I have already observ'd as to the form of Penance, and that of extreme unction, is more than sufficient to satisfy any one, that the variety is not confin'd to simple rites that accompany the principal form, but that it is extended to the very form itself. One finds moreover a great variety in the form of Marriage<sup>i</sup>; nothing is less uniform than the prayer join'd to the benediction, and which properly composes the form. Again, one cannot find in the most ancient offices any steps of the form, *Ego vos conjungo*, &c. which has ever since passed among our School Divines as the only form of Matrimony. Thus much is evident, that particular Churches have assum'd to themselves an intire liberty with regard to these forms, without any consequence being ever drawn from it against the validity of these Sacraments.

The custom being so evident, the conclusion is easily drawn from it; that particular Churches are in possession of a right to draw up for themselves a form for the administration of the Sacraments; and that this form not agreeing with other forms, save only as to the

<sup>i</sup> Martin de Rit. Eccles. tom. 2. p. 614. & seq.

substance, no body ought for that reason, to conclude either this or that form to be invalid. The proof of this variety is to be found in the collections of the ancient rites that have been publish'd; and the proof of the validity of the Sacraments, is from the mutual communion that is maintained, without ever thinking of a reiteration of them. It has therefore been always thought that every Church, much more every national Church (preserving the substance and spirit of the prayers necessary for the form of a Sacrament) is mistress so as to alter, to enlarge, to abridge, and in a word, to make such a disposition as she shall judge most convenient for the edification of the people, and her own benefit. The Church of *England* therefore only made use of that power which she has in common with all other Churches, in directing such rites in her form of Ordination, as she judged necessary, if she has in other respects preserv'd, as I have proved she has, all that can be reputed essential.

This practice of particular Churches is also founded upon reason: For 1. There is no doubt but that ~~that~~ which is not determined by the holy Scripture, nor by the constant practice of the universal Church, nor by any uncontested decision of a general council, does belong to discipline. Now it is a known Maxim in *France*, and a fundamental principle of our Laws and Liberties, that every Church is mistress of her own discipline, and that even the authority of a general council cannot oblige her to give them up; and that notwithstanding such decrees, she ought to maintain her own Usages. It is upon this principle that we have ever opposed in *France* the reception of the decrees of the council of *Trent* upon the subject of discipline; but as to the matter of doctrine, this council is received as general. Besides, it is manifest that the forms of the greatest number of the Sacraments, are neither determin'd by holy Scripture, nor by any decision of a general council, and yet less by the constant uniform practice of Churches; among whom we have

have remark'd a very great variety. This determination therefore belongs to discipline, and consequently is within the jurisdiction of Churches, which is a power not to be contested without depriving them of a right which they have ever claim'd. The Church of *England* might therefore alter the prayers of her Ordinal, without any umbrage for concluding that her Ordinations are for that reason invalid.

But if it be said that particular Churches have a power to make some alterations in their discipline, yet it is not true that they can exercise such a power in important articles, such as the celibacy of the Clergy, the celebration in *azymo aut fermentato*, the forms of the Sacraments, &c. without exposing themselves to the guilt of Schism, and their Sacraments to an invalidity; particular Churches not having a right properly, but in particular points relating to their own discipline, and not in things important, and which they have in common with other Churches.

This objection is very plausible; but at the bottom what does it prove? That particular Churches must make no alterations of moment in articles of Discipline which they have in common with other Churches, without their consent? I grant it. And they cannot make these alterations without being guilty of Schism; this, perhaps is also true. But does it follow from thence that that which they perform is null; where is the consequence? And how is it prov'd? Is the position true, that a particular Church cannot make any changes that are important without being declar'd guilty of Schism? What? Suppose the Church of *France*, for certain urgent reasons, which she alone is appris'd of, should think it proper to restore, for example, the chalice to the Laity, to restore her first Liturgy, to reform her Rites, and to recall them back to their antient simplicity, without falling out in other respects with foreign Churches; who would dare to charge us with Schism? And ought not they rather to be regarded as Schismatics, who should  
take



take an occasion from such a change to separate themselves from us? But let us drop for a moment the business of the Schism: How is it prov'd from thence that the Sacrament is null, which such a Church administers? There can be no nullity but for one of these two reasons. Either that Schism renders null all Sacraments administer'd out of the Church, or else that the changes introduc'd by the Schism affect the substance of the Sacraments. The first reason is false, and disavow'd by all catholick Divines. And I have prov'd the falshood of the second, by making it as clear as noon day, that the *English* have preserv'd in their form all that was ever reputed essential, since the changes which they have made are of no other kind than a bare variation of the prayers, and that they conserv'd all the spirit of the antient forms, and all the substance of what ought to be offer'd up to God upon this occasion.

But suppose, say they, that particular Churches are mistresses of their discipline, and that they have a power to make what changes they think necessary; yet one must not conclude, that they therefore can make what alterations they please with respect to forms, since Divines never thought that the forms of Sacraments were a part of Discipline, and that they always look'd upon the matter and form of Sacraments as things sacred, which neither particular Men, nor particular Churches, were permitted to meddle with.

I do not pretend to examine here the common opinion of the Schools, with regard to the pretended invariability of the matter and form of the Sacraments, which perhaps ought to be look'd upon as a mere chimera, after the facts which I have produc'd, and which certainly is disavow'd by several Divines. Among others *Boyvin* explains himself very fully upon this article. For after having rais'd a difficulty taken from the variety found between the matter and forms us'd by the *Latins* and by the *Greeks*, he answers it  
in

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 171

in these Wrods. <sup>k</sup> To this it is answer'd, that tho' each Church did not always use the same matter and form of Ordination, no not even the *Latin* Church, yet *Christ* instituted the matter and form of all Orders, if not particularly, yet in general; commanding his Apostles, that they should confer Orders by certain words and visible signs; yet he left the Church a power to determine what positive words and signs should be us'd; which ought not to be wonder'd at, since somewhat of the same kind is seen in the Sacraments of Penance and Matrimony. Now the reason why this altering power is given the Church, as to the matter and form of these three Sacraments exclusive of the others, which are always to be immutable, is this, that the matter of these Sacraments consists in somewhat that belongs to morality, and therefore ought to be subjected to the will of the Church, who is the director of all the faithful. — This is the answer of the Doctors *Hallerius, Præpositus, Gamachæi*.

<sup>k</sup> Unde ad hoc respondendum est, quod licet utraque Ecclesia non semper usa fuerit eadem materia & forma Ordinationis, imo nec Ecclesia Latina eandem semper adhibuerit, non minus tamen instituerit Christus materiam & formam omnium Ordinum, non quidem in specie, sed saltem in genere; præcipiendo Apostolis ut conferrent Ordines per aliquot verba & signa sensibilia—licet reliquerit Ecclesiæ facultatem determinandi de talibus verbis ac signis. Quod mirum videri non debet, cum aliquid simile habeatur in Sacramentis Pœnitentiæ & Matrimonii—Ratio autem cur talis mutatio materiæ & formæ Ecclesiæ concedatur circa hæc tria Sacramenta, & non circa alia quæ omnimodam servant immutabilitatem, pendet ex hoc, quod istorum materia Sacramentorum in aliquo morali consistat quod debet proinde subesse voluntati Ecclesiæ, quæ est omnium fidelium superior—Hæc est responsio Doctorum Hallerii, Præpositi, Gamachæi, Ilamberti, & aliorum qui dicunt non variare materiam Ordinationis in ratione formali, sub qua illam instituit Christus, nempe in signo sensibili sumpto in Communi, sed variare tantum materialiter hoc signum in particulari. Unde nil mirum est, si alio ritu sensibili utantur Græci, & alio Latini, imo si alio ritu alias usa sit Ecclesia Latina, & alio in hoc Seculo. Boyvin. Theolog. quadripart. part. 2. De Ordin. p. 242.

“chaus,

“ *chaus, Isambertus*, and others, who affirm that the  
 “ matter of order does not alter as to the form in  
 “ which *Christ* instituted it, namely, in the visible  
 “ signs us’d in common, but only materially as to this  
 “ in particular. Therefore it is no wonder, that the  
 “ *Greeks* use different Rites from the *Latins*, nay, that  
 “ the *Latin Church* has practis’d different Ceremonies  
 “ from those us’d by her at present.” A Man there-  
 fore may, without any scruple, reject the invariability  
 now in question, as well as several Divines have  
 done. But I would willingly be more complaisant,  
 provided that the other side would not dispute facts  
 that are notorious and evident. Nothing is more evi-  
 dent than the variety which Churches have observ’d  
 with respect to forms. If therefore there be some-  
 what in them unalterable, and which does not pro-  
 perly belong to the discipline of the Church, it fol-  
 lows that we distinguish with Cardinal <sup>1</sup> *Bona* two  
 things with regard to forms; namely, that which all  
 Churches observe in common, and what is particular  
 to each. By this rule, I grant that nothing practis’d  
 in common by all Churches can be alter’d without de-  
 stroying the Sacrament: But it must also be allow’d  
 me, that alterations made in things which were nei-  
 ther practis’d at all times and in all places, do not  
 destroy the substance of the Sacrament. In a word,  
 that which was always and universally practis’d is un-  
 alterable, for tradition is an infallible rule in this  
 case; but as to what is neither perpetual nor uni-  
 form, each Church may make what alterations she  
 thinks necessary, and Sacraments are not to be reite-  
 rated that are confer’d by forms that have undergone  
 such changes.

The application of this principle is very easy. In  
 Ordination two things are necessary, *viz.* what was  
 practis’d at all times and in all places; these were the  
 imposition of hands, and prayer, to request of God  
 to pour down his Spirit upon the person to receive

<sup>1</sup> *Rer. Liturgic. lib. 1. cap. 6.*



of the English ORDINATIONS. 173

orders, and that he would enable him to discharge worthily the duties of his function: But the disposition of the prayers, their number, and composition, the ceremonies, and particular rites us'd at the same time; have neither perpetuity, universality nor uniformity, as Cardinal *Bona* observes with regard to the Eucharist: "But <sup>m</sup> says he, the rites and ceremonies by which all things are perform'd, the words in which the Prayers are conceiv'd, the disposition of the ceremonies, and other things of lesser moment have varied, and are peculiar to divers Churches, these things not being so instituted by the Apostles or apostolical Men, as to be perpetual and immutable." These things have been alter'd according to the several circumstances of times and places, and particular Churches have not always observ'd the same rites as any body may perceive. Now the Church of *England* has made no change in this first Article, but barely in the second, which is a point of discipline very mutable, as it hath been prov'd in the preceding Chapters; she therefore has made no alteration, but where she had a right to do it, and consequently her Ordinations ought not to be tax'd with being invalid. This first argument must therefore be reputed demonstrative in its kind.

A second argument proper to prove the authority of a National Church, to make what alterations she shall think necessary in the forms of the Sacraments as long as the substance is preserv'd, is this, that each Church, and even the Church of *Rome*, has no right to make other Churches submit to her own proper discipline, as it is prov'd at large by the author of the new Treatise, concerning the Authority of the *Pope*, printed at the *Hague* in 1720. In short, however jealous the

<sup>m</sup> Modus autem & ritus quibus hæc omnia peraguntur, verba quibus preces concipiuntur, ordo ceremoniarum, & reliqua minoris momenti, diversis Ecclesiis diversa & peculiaria sunt, nec ita ab Apostolis & ab Apostolicis viris instituta fuerunt, ut perpetua forent, & immutabilia. Ibid.

Popes may have been to maintain their authority, the more prudent have been so moderate as to leave particular Churches at their liberty to regulate their own discipline; nay, even when they had a power to prescribe. This is what evidently appears by a letter of *St. Gregories* to *Augustine* the Monk, who was surpris'd to find the faith of all Churches the same, and the discipline different; yet it was not required that he should introduce the customs of the Church of *Rome* into *England*.<sup>n</sup> “ But it will please me, says  
 “ this great Pope writing to him, that if you have  
 “ met with any thing either in the Church of *Rome*,  
 “ in the Churches of *France*, or in any other Church  
 “ whatsoever, more pleasing to Almighty God, that  
 “ you would carefully select it, and instill into the  
 “ Church of *England*, as yet new in the faith, by  
 “ especial sanction, those usages which you find  
 “ practis'd by several Churches: We are not in love  
 “ with customs upon the account of the places where  
 “ they are practis'd, but we admire Countries for their  
 “ good customs; therefore out of every Church make  
 “ choice of what is pious, what is religious, what is  
 “ just; and these being collected into a body, you  
 “ are to introduce them into practice among the  
 “ *English*.” So that what presumption soever there might be, in favour of the Church of *Rome*, yet it was never believ'd that other Churches made it a rule to submit to her Discipline and Laws, because each Church has sufficient authority for these things, and is furnish'd with Men that are wise and learned enough to make such Laws as are good; which is

<sup>n</sup> Sed mihi placet, ut five in Romana, five in Galliarum, five in qualibet alia Ecclesia, aliquid invenisti, quod plus omnipotenti Deo possit placere, sollicite eligas, & in Anglorum Ecclesia, quæ adhuc in fide nova est, institutione præcipua quæ de multis Ecclesiis colligere potuisti, infundas; non enim pro locis res, sed pro rebus loca nobis amanda sunt. Ex singulis ergo quibusque Ecclesiis quæ pia, quæ religiosa, quæ recta sunt elige, & hæc quasi in fasciculum collecta, apud Anglorum mentes in consuetudine depone, Greg. M. lib. 11. ep. 64.

observ'd

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 175

observ'd by an antient author of a Book upon the Sacraments, attributed to ° St. Ambrose ; " I desire in  
 " all things, says he, to follow the Church of Rome,  
 " but yet we our selves have Men of sense ; therefore  
 " when in other Churches things are better regulated,  
 " we comply with those rules."

It is in consequence of this principle, that particular Churches have each their Liturgies and Rituals different from their neighbour Churches. P " In many things, says Fulbert of Chartres, the Churches  
 " of Greece differ from Spain, and they from those  
 " of Rome and France, nor are we scandaliz'd for this  
 " reason." These have retain'd their particular customs, notwithstanding the arts us'd to induce them to abandon them : For as Gerson observes, every Country abounds in its own way of thinking. <sup>a</sup> *Qualibet Provincia in sensu suo abundat.* According to the account which Walfridus Strabo gives, the Church of Rome herself has, in the drawing up of her offices, made use of those compos'd by other Churches <sup>r</sup>,  
 " quia Gallicana Ecclesia viris non minus peritissimis instructa, sacrorum officiorum instrumenta habebat non minima, ex eis aliqua Romanorum officiis immixta dicuntur. Nay, even since the majority of the western Churches, in compliance with their Princes, have adopted the Liturgy as well as the Rituals and Pontificals of Rome ; they did not abridge themselves of the authority to make what changes and alterations they thought necessary, because this right is unalienable, and which in effect they exercis'd <sup>f</sup>, when they refus'd to conform to the alterations which Rome made in her Pontifical in the year 1645, in restoring the antient usages which they had abandon'd. And that in

° In omnibus cupio sequi Ecclesiam Romanam ; sed tamen & nos homines habemus sensum : ideo quod alibi rectius servatur, & nos rectius custodimus, Lib. 3. cap. 1. P Græcia ab Hispania, ab illis Romana & Gallica discrepat Ecclesia ; sed neque in hoc scandalizamus, Fulbert. Carn. Ep. 2. <sup>a</sup> Gers. De Stat. Eccles. Edit. noviss. p. 533. t. 2. <sup>r</sup> Lib. de Reb. Eccles. cap. 15. <sup>f</sup> Nouv. Mem. du Clergé, To. 5. p. 472.



short, according to St. <sup>r</sup> *Augustine's* maxim, in things not determin'd by the Holy Scripture, the true rule is to follow the practice of each particular Church, whose power no body ought to dispute in prescribing her own proper discipline, even in the more essential parts of the Sacraments, as an antient Author observes. "Hence it seems to arise, that *Christ* says "do this in remembrance of me; he says not, do it "after this manner, from whence it happens that "certain institutions of the Christian Religion, as "they were practis'd in the infancy of Christianity, "were afterwards disus'd upon several reasonable accounts." Now, since there is no Church which has a right to subject other Churches to her discipline; it naturally follows, that the Church of *England*, as well as any other, may compose her own Prayers, regulate her own Liturgy, and direct the manner of the administration of her own Sacraments according to her own mind; and in a word, to make what changes she thinks fit, provided they are compatible with the essential parts of the Institutions, which are common to all Churches', and practis'd in all Ages.

This second argument appears to be as solid as the former, and there are no difficulties which arise; that seem important enough to oblige us to give it up: The only one which seems to merit our attention is this; that if the Church of *Rome* has no power to subject other Churches to her own discipline, yet it cannot be disputed, but that she has, at least, a power to oblige other Churches to observe the discipline long since establish'd throughout the whole Church; and that if for example, a *Latin* Church should, in the celebration of the Eucharist use lea-

<sup>r</sup> August. Ep. 54. "Hinc esse videtur quod ait (Christus) hoc facite in meam commemorationem. Non ait, hoc modo facite. Unde nonnulla Christianæ Religionis instituta eum in Ecclesiæ nascentis initio suæ modum originis accepere, quem in progressu ejusdem credentis propter quasdam rationabiles causas non diu tenuere. Ernulphus Roffens. Ep. 2. Tom. 2. Spicil.

vened Bread, 'in such a case she has a right to forbid the practice. And tho' it be agreed that in other respects the discipline of Churches is very different, yet it cannot at all be granted, that this variety extends it self to the forms of the Sacraments, and that they are to be reputed a part of the discipline, which particular Churches have a right to concern themselves with.

It is not at all necessary to dwell too long upon the refutation of this last reason, since we have already prov'd that this variety has extended it self to all the forms of the administration of the Sacraments, at least to those that were not determin'd by Scripture; and that the regulation, and the composition of the prayers which constitute the form of the Sacraments, cannot be otherwise regarded than as making part of the discipline. The words of Cardinal *Bona* are very exprefs: *Verba quibus Preces concipiuntur*. Father *Morin* is yet more exprefs, for he has assign'd the power of making forms to particular Churches. \* *Quare videtur omnino dicendum istarum rerum determinationem esse definitioni Ecclesiarum permissam*. It is true, that this same Father afterwards maintains that the matter and form of the Sacraments are unalterable; but then he only speaks of their substance, and not at all of the determinate form of words, which hath been alter'd according to the temper of times and places. " I again affirm, that neither does the *Latin* form so " substantially differ from the *Greek* — nor doth it a- " ny way belong to the essence of the Sacrament, " whether the form be indicative or deprecatory, as " long as the usage of their own Church is com- " ply'd with." Now the fixing the form of words is no less indifferent, with respect to the substance of the Sacraments, than the way of denouncing them, and all this is generally speaking compris'd in what is accidental to the form. Besides, the proofs which we

\* De Sacram Poenit. lib. 8. c. 17.      y Dico iterum nec sic formam Latinam à Græcâ substantialiter differre—nec ullo modo ad Sacramenti substantiam pertinere, indicative an deprecative enuntietur, modò Ecclesiæ suæ ritum sequatur, Ibid. c. 18.

have produc'd, as to this truth, must convince all reasonable Men, that the manner of drawing up the forms is a matter of mere discipline.

As to what is said that the Church of *Rome* has a power to oblige particular Churches to comply with the discipline, establish'd for many ages throughout the whole Church, and to restrain them upon a non-compliance, this is true in a limited sense ; but it makes nothing at all against the maxim which we have laid down. It is true, that in some sense the Church of *Rome* has a general power to inspect into the conduct of particular Churches, and that in this quality, she is the depositary of the authority of the Church, to cause the laws and usages to be comply'd with, that she ought to see that the holy Canons are obey'd, and to prevent their being either weaken'd, or forgotten by inattention or relaxation ; to maintain with care and exactness, all that may contribute to the conservation of divine worship, morality, discipline, peace.

But that it is a consequence from such a power, that national Churches can make no considerable alterations in their discipline when they think it convenient, and that the Church of *Rome* may hinder such changes, and declare the Sacraments invalid where they are made ; this seems to me a thing impossible to be prov'd. The Council of *Trent*<sup>2</sup> only refus'd to acknowledge such a power to be lodg'd in particular Pastors. And in short, not to depart from the example alledg'd, as to the celebration of the Eucharist, perform'd by the *Latin* with leavened, and by the *Greek* Church with unleavened Bread ; who will be persuaded that such a consecration is invalid ? Moreover, if it be presum'd, as indeed it ought, that the *Latin* or the *Greek* Church follow'd in this article a change establish'd by a Province or an intire Nation, where of she is a member ; this is no metaphysical que-

<sup>2</sup> Sess. 7. de Sacr. in gen. can. 13.



tion. The *Armenians*,<sup>a</sup> and the *Maronites* among the *Greeks* having forsaken the use of leavened Bread to take up with the unleavened: But was their consecration ever reputed invalid for this reason? Or, if some weak passionate writers thought so, yet was not their opinion, by all wise clear sighted divines regarded as an error.

It is to no purpose to alledge that these two Nations did nothing else in this than reunite themselves to the Catholick Church; for it is agreed among the *Latins*, that this usage being indifferent, each one ought to follow the practice of his own Church; and that it is no more lawful for a *Greek* to conform himself to the *Latins*, than for a *Latin* to conform himself to the *Greeks*; so that the case is perfectly equal; and truly I agree that both one and the other does very ill: but to believe, either on the one side or the other, that the Sacrament was null, is what no rational Divine will come into, they having determin'd on the contrary, that truly the sin consists in a Man's not conforming himself to the usage of his own Church; but that the consecration is not for that reason the less valid. A man may consult upon this subject *Estius*, *Sylvius*, *Suarez*, *Vasquez*, *Mærat*, *de Rhodes*, *F. Alexander*, and a number of other Divines of a different party, who are agreed in the same opinion.

But I affirm moreover, that it is not absolutely true, that the Church of *Rome* has always a right to oblige particular Churches to observe the discipline established in the rest of the Church. If these particular Churches forsake the common practice and the law, either by abuse, by relaxation, or by negligence, then indeed the Church of *Rome* may exercise her right of inspection and of vigilance, for the conservation of Discipline and of the Holy Canons: But if important reasons should induce these Churches to make alterations in important points of discipline, I do not

<sup>a</sup> Cardinal Bona Rer. Liturg. lib. 1. cap. 23.

see wherein the Church of *Rome* can oblige them to conform to the rest.

I am well apprised that these sort of changes ought not to be undertaken without consulting other Churches, especially the chief of other Churches; but it is one thing to do what a Man ought, and another thing to do what one may. I am sensible that it is ill done to make alterations without staying for the assent of the *Roman* Church; but this does not authorize that Church to declare every thing null that was done without her consent, and to reverse every thing establish'd without her participation. If, for example, as the late M. *Bessuet* Bishop of *Méaux* \* wish'd, the Church of *France* should think it necessary to re-establish the Communion in both kinds, and that she did really establish this without requiring the consent of *Rome*; would a Man be easily persuaded that that Church could oblige us to revoke such a re-establishment, and that if she separated from us for this reason, would the Schism be more imputed to us than to her? There is certainly no reason to believe it; and we are all persuaded of the contrary, that in the change of discipline, which is done with the consent of a Church, and a whole Nation, the cause being very evident, and for reasons which she looks upon as grave and necessary, no other Church can oblige her to renounce such an alteration.

But be it as it will, whether the Church of *Rome* has power or no, to make particular Churches submit to the discipline universally establish'd, yet it suffices at present, that this power which we seem to allow her, does not give her any right to make those Sacraments null, wherein there have been no alterations made, but in things determin'd, and where other things have been preserv'd that have been reputed essential in the Church. Now the alterations made in the Rite of Ordination in *England* are precisely of this nature, as it has been made evident at

\* See his Letter in the Appendix

length. So that granting it just to condemn the changes as unlawful, which the Church of *England* made in the form of Ordination, this can be no reason to prove the Sacrament invalid: For, as it is very well observ'd by *F. Alexander*, the Sacrament does not become invalid but when the sense of the form is destroy'd. <sup>b</sup> *Additio verborum quæ debitum formæ Sacramentalis sensum corrumpunt, tollit veritatem Sacramenti—si verò ejusmodi additio fiat, quæ non auferat debitum sensum, non tollitur Sacramenti veritas.* This Doctor goes yet much further, seeing he observes, that when the addition is made with a design to favour Heresy, provided it does not break in upon the essence of the form, yet the Sacrament is effectually valid. *Quamvis porro addatur aliquid contra fidei veritatem, si tamen formam non afficiat, nec in eam refundatur, aut ejus sensum variet, non tollit veritatem Sacramenti—Quod autem preces hæresim continentes, non reddant irritum Sacramentum, cum formæ Sacramentali adjunguntur, nec eam tamen efficiunt & corrumpunt, docet S. August. lib. 6. de Bap. c. 25.*

And to the end that it might not be thought that he only spoke here of heretical additions inserted by inattention, or by fraud, he adds, <sup>c</sup> "If he inserts these words, not as if he would have them to be a part of the Sacramental form, but to divulge his error, or in order to draw others into the same Heresy, it may be a true and valid Consecration, as long as he intends to do what the Church intends should be done." Now, who dares maintain that the additions made to the *English Ordinal* do destroy the sense of the form, *debitum formæ Sacramentalis sensum*? He will be convicted of falshood only by reading the prayers of the Ritual, which ex-

<sup>b</sup> Nat. Alex. Theol. Dog. & mor. lib. 2. cap. 3. reg. 6. <sup>c</sup> Si adjungeret hæc verba—non quasi partem formæ Sacramentalis esse vellet, sed ut errorem suum indicaret, aut alios in eandem hæresim pertraheret, vera esset & rata consecratio, modò intenderet facere quod facit Ecclesia.



cellently preserves the Spirit of the Church in the Ordination of her Ministers.

A third reason which one may insist upon, is taken from the alterations which the Church of *Rome* made in her own Ordinals, and from the corrections which she thought necessary to make in her Rituals. As to the corrections, I never saw any other authority for them, but the Bishop of *Pianza's* Epistle dedicatory to Pope *Innocent* the eighth, before his Edition of the Pontifical printed at *Rome* in 1485; he speaks to him thus<sup>e</sup>, *Pontificalis Libri emendationem, B. P. tuo jussu aggressus sum; opus sanè laboriosum, varium, atque ut multis fortasse gratum, ita & invidiæ plenum: Rei enim vetustate, Ecclesiarum multitudine, temporum & prælatorum varietate effectum est, ut vix duo aut tres codices inveniantur, qui id m tradant. Eodem modo quot libri, tot varietates; ille deficit, hic superabundat; alius nihil omnino de eâ re habet, rarò aut nunquam conveniunt.* And as to the variations, they are so remarkable, that they have embarrass'd the greatest part of our Divines. In the offices of *Penance*, of *Ordination*, and in that of *Marriage* the ancient offices or rituals contain nothing of the same with those forms to which the Divines of these days affix the idea of a form. Neither *Ego vos absolvo* nor the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, nor the *Ego vos conjungo*, made their appearance untill the later centuries; and the thing is so evident, that some authors laid it down as a rule to themselves, to prove that *Jesus Christ* never particularly determin'd the forms of the Sacraments. <sup>f</sup> " This is the answer, says *Boyd* " *vin* in his book of *Theology*, of the Doctors *Hallerius*, " *Præpositus*, *Gamaehaus*, *Isambertus*, and others, who

<sup>e</sup> Pontif. Rom. Edit. Roman. 1485. <sup>f</sup> Hæc est responsio Doct. Hallerii, Præpositi, Gamachæi, Isamberti, & aliorum, qui dicunt non variare materiam Ordinationis in ratione formali, sub qua illam instituit Christus—sed variare tantum materialiter hoc signum in particulari. Unde nihil mirum est—si alio ritu alias usa sit Ecclesia Latina, & alio in hoc sæculo. Theol. quadrip. ubi supra.

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 183

“ affirm that the *matter of order* does not vary as to its  
“ *ratio formalis* under which Christ instituted it, but  
“ only materially as to this sign in particular ; there-  
“ fore it is not surprising that the *Latin Church*, at  
“ several times, used several ceremonies different from  
“ those used at this day.”

It necessarily follows from these corrections and variations, that particular Churches are not oblig'd to follow the forms which the Church of *Rome* herself does not look upon as essential. Now those forms which have been alter'd, and which have been reform'd, can never pass for essential forms which other Churches are bound to submit to. One must therefore look upon it as a thing certain, that every Church has a right without prescription, to regulate forms not determined by *Jesus Christ*.

Lastly, another reason which gives yet a greater force to the three former, is that it appears evidently by the ancient monuments, that there were no Liturgies or written forms for the administration of the Sacraments us'd in the Church before the fifth century. This were easy to prove at large, if I did not rather chuse to recommend to the readers perusal a treatise of Liturgies by *David Clarkson* a learned Englishman, and the excellent work of Father *Le Brun* upon the Liturgies, that I may not unnecessarily swell up this Chapter.

Now supposing the truth of this proposition, it necessarily follows, that each Church may add or retrench her forms and prayers, without being restrain'd to any thing but to the substance and the spirit of the prayer or form, in which one may easily preserve an uniformity, by the means of Tradition, which preserves the substance, and seldom does the same as to the words, when these do moreover consist in long prayers and long forms, which it were very difficult for her to retain.

*Clarkson's Treatise of Liturgies*, Sect. 4, 5, 6. *Le Brun*, tom. 2. diff. 1. p. 4, &c.

I am at a loss to know how a Man can refuse to submit to the force and evidence of these reasons; yet one can easily enough agree that a particular Church may make those alterations, in as much as she continues a member of the catholick Church. But it is asserted that an heretical or a schismatical Church has lost by her heresy and schism, that power which belongs to all particular Churches that continue members of the catholick Church, because that her rebellion against the Church disqualifies her to act in her name; and that whatever she performs does not appear to have any validity, but so far as she does it in the name of the catholick Church.

This is one of those reasons which St. *Cyprian* urg'd most against Pope *Stephen*: But it must likewise be allow'd, that if this argument takes place, it annihilates all that he did out of the Church: And moreover, we have here to oppose the possession of heretical Churches, and their practice in composing their rites and ceremonies, without any objections raised against the validity of their Sacraments. M. *P. Abbe Renaudot* is an unexceptionable evidence of this usage. <sup>h</sup> "That *James of Edesse*," says he speaking of *Syriac* Liturgies, "and others more modern authors were the compilers of them, we have no reason to doubt, because it was the discipline of the *Jacobite* Churches, that their Bishops should have authority in directing their sacred offices, and in establishing their Liturgies; which authority was yet more extensive among the *Syrians* than among the *Egyptians*." And a Man must be very reserved in his way of thinking, if he imagines that this power reach'd only to rites less essential. The same

<sup>h</sup> Jacobum Edessenum & alios recentiores, suarum auctores fuisse, non est cur dubitemus. Jacobiticæ quippe Ecclesiæ disciplina fuit, ut Episcopi summam in sacris officiis disponendis precibusque ordinandis haberent auctoritatem; quæ etiam inter Syros major omnino quam inter Ægyptios fuit. Tom. 2. Liturg. Orient. diff. de Lit. Syr. p. 18.



author adds, that they exercis'd this power with respect to the forms of Baptism, of Penance, and of Marriage; the same also as to those Liturgies which we look upon as the most solemn and sacred in religion. <sup>1</sup> "*Igitur ex Episcopali autoritate, quâ Orientales Antistites uti sunt, in ordinandis ecclesiasticis officiis, ut Baptismi administrandi formulas, ritualesque libros, cum adjunctis precibus, coronationis seu benedictionis nuptialis, absolutionis pœnitentium, & alia non pauca, ita quoque Liturgias scripsere, &c.*" This also is the opinion of Father *Le Brun* as to these Liturgies, as it will appear hereafter.

The alteration made in the *Armenian Church* as to the celebration of the Eucharist with unleavened Bread, a practice which she introduc'd in opposition to all the *oriental Churches*, since she suffer'd herself to be infected with the *Eutychian Heresy*, evidently shews that Heresy or Schism does not deprive a Church of the power to alter ceremonies of the greatest consequence, and that she loses no authority of this kind upon the account of her Schism.

If any body will be so bold as to maintain, that we here give too great a power to heretical Churches; that rather it ought to be confin'd to a change of some ceremonies, or of some rites annex'd to the administration of the Sacraments, to render that office more solemn: This supposition is easily refuted, and that by a bare relation of the alterations themselves which were made, and by the impossibility of fixing to any purpose the power of an heretical Church, upon any other foot than that of a Church in communion with the catholic, upon the point of the validity or invalidity of a Sacrament: So that it is necessary to have recourse to facts, to discover how far the oriental Sects extended their authority in this matter, and what some people have thought of the validity of their Sacraments.

<sup>2</sup> Liturg. Orient. diff. de Lit. Syr. tom. 2. p. 18.

## 186 A DEFENCE of the Validity

If there is any Sacrament in which we ought to be tender of making an alteration in the form, it is that of the Eucharist; nevertheless it is found not to have been exempted from it in heretical Churches, without ever bringing into question the validity of the Consecration.

I say nothing here of the variety of the canon, which ought to be of some weight, of some consequence, with those who know that the *Greeks* and the *Orientalists* had an eye to the canon, wherein at least the invocation of the Holy Spirit, which is there included as an essential part of the Consecration, and consequently as making a part of the form. But as to the very words of *Jesus Christ*, what variety is there in the oriental Liturgies! If one consults the *Greek* collection of M. l'Abbe Renaudot, he will find proofs sufficient.

In the *Syriac* Liturgy which bears the name of *Marthæw* the Pastor, behold the manner how the form is express'd; <sup>k</sup> "This is my flesh which is divided for all the faithful adhering to me, that it may be eaten to the forgiveness of sins, &c. In like manner, the Cup—he blessed, sanctified, and also gave it to those who were initiated by his institution, and commended it to them, that all might partake of it; and that by it he declar'd Salvation should be to all that drank of it, &c."

In the Liturgy of *Thomas* of *Heraclea*, the variety is still more. <sup>l</sup> "Christ took bread and wine, he ble-

<sup>k</sup> Hoc est caro mea, quæ pro omnibus fidelibus mihi adinrentibus dividitur, ut comedatur, ad expiationem delictorum, &c. Similiter & calicem—benedixit, sanctificavit, deditque etiam illum mysterio suo initiatis, commendavitque illis ut ex eo omnes communicarent, quodque in eo salus bibentibus illam esset declaravit, &c. Renaudot. Liturg. Orient. tom. 2. p. 348.

<sup>l</sup> Accipit (Christus) panem & vinum, benedixit, sanctificavit, fregit, deditq; Apostolis suis dicens. Accipite, utimini, & ita facite. Et cum hoc acceperitis, credite & certi estote quod corpus meum editis & sanguinem bibitis, in memoriam mortis meæ facientes donec veniam. Ibid. p. 384.

sed, he sanctified, he brake, and gave it to his Apostles, saying, receive it, use it, and do it after this manner. And when you have receiv'd this, believe, and be assured, that ye have eaten my body, and drank my blood in remembrance of my death, doing thus until I come."

The Liturgy of *Dennis Barsalibi* supplies us with another fresh instance of this variety; for in speaking of *Jesus Christ*, he says, that being to suffer death, "The bread which he took he blessed, he sanctified, he brake and called it his holy body, and that it should be life eternal to those who received it. *Amen*. And the Cup which he mix'd with wine and water, he blessed, and made it his precious blood to them who received it to obtain eternal Life. *Amen*."

Here is yet a further disagreement; for in the Liturgy which bears the name of *St. Sextus*, and in the second attributed to *St. Peter*, the words of *Jesus Christ* are not to be met with in almost any one Manuscript, and there are no others found but these here, *Accipite, manducate in remissionem peccatorum, & vitam æternam. Amen*.

After disagreements so essential in a form which all the world looks upon as determin'd by Christ, it is unnecessary that I should dwell upon other alterations which are reputed less important, and which do not deserve the same consideration: Such is that in the *Ethiopic* Liturgy, the form is this; "This bread is my body which is broken for you, for the remission of sins." Or in the *Alexandrian* Liturgy of *St. Gregory*, where the form is addressed to *Jesus Christ* him-

<sup>m</sup> Panem etiam quem accepit. benedixit, sanctificavit, fregit, & corpus sanctum vocavit eum in vitam æternam illis qui illud acciperent. Amen. Et Calicem quem miscuerat vino & aquâ, benedixit, & sanguinem suum pretiosum perfecit illis qui illum accipiunt in vitam æternam. Amen. Ibid. p. 454. <sup>n</sup> Hic panis est corpus meum, quod pro vobis frangitur in remissionem peccatorum. Ibid. tom. I. p. 517.



self, after this manner; ° “Thou hast given thanks  
 “thou hast blessed, thou hast sanctified, thou has ad-  
 “ministred to thy holy Disciples and Apostles, and  
 “hast said, *Take, eat, this is my body which is broken and*  
 “*given for you and for many, for the remission of sins—*  
 “*This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for*  
 “*you and for many.*” I should not have taken notice of  
 these latter variations, as being very little essential, if  
 it were convenient to shew that in the forms deter-  
 min’d by *Jesus Christ*, the least alterations are as much  
 capital, as more considerable ones, in these forms  
 which are left to the determination of the Church;  
 and if one is not confin’d to a certain mode of ex-  
 pression, when the same is found express’d in the  
 Scripture, a Man may give himself a greater liberty  
 when there is no dispute but of prayers and forms  
 which have neither perpetuity, universality, nor con-  
 formity.

But that which is most important to observe, is  
 that these alterations which appear so essential, were  
 made by Sects <sup>P</sup> separated from the catholick Church  
 whose power was never disputed to make these Chan-  
 ges, and whose Consecration was never reputed null  
 and invalid. The Learned are agreed, in effect, that  
 these Sects were separated from the catholick Church  
 when they drew up their Liturgies. 9 “The Heresi-  
 “of the *Nestorians* and of the *Eutychians*, says the

° *Gratias egisti, benedixisti, sanctificasti, fregisti, dedisti sanctis*  
*tuis Discipulis & Apostolis, dixisti que accipite, edite, hoc est*  
*corpus meum, quod pro vobis & pro multis frangitur & da-*  
*tur in remissionem peccatorum———Hic est sanguis me-*  
*us Novi Testamenti, qui pro vobis, & pro multis effunditur*  
 &c. Ibid. p. 104.      P Bona, Liturg. l. 1. c. 9.      9 L’He-

roisie des Nestoriens & des Eutychiens fut un nouveau mo-  
 tif d’écrire la Liturgie, parce qu’on devoit craindre qu’ils ne l’a-  
 terassent. Des lors en effet les Catholiques & les Heretiques se  
 écrivirent à l’envi des uns & des autres; & comme les uns & les  
 autres les ont portées dans tout le monde, rien ne peut mieux  
 servir à montrer l’origine commune de toutes les Liturgies avant  
 le concile d’Ephese. Liturg. tom. 2. p. 135.

“learned

learned Father *Le Brun*, was a new motive to reduce the Liturgy to writing, because there was reason to fear that they might change it. From that time the Catholicks and the Hereticks vied with each other in writing it, and when the Liturgies both of the one and the other were publish'd, nothing conduc'd more to shew the common origin of all the Liturgies before the council of *Ephesus*. But when this does not appear, yet it is sufficient to perswade a Man to believe that these Liturgies were not drawn up, strictly speaking, untill these Sects had their Birth; that the greatest number of them have the names of their authors annex'd to them, who were known *Nestorians* and *Eutychians*; that the little uniformity they bear with the *Greek* and *Latin* Liturgies, is a plain proof that they were not copied from them; that frequently the errors of these Sects are insinuated at least, if they do not always shew themselves openly; and that in fine, besides the testimonies of the Learned, who do not at all dispute their belonging to these Sects, the corrections which they underwent at *Rome*, is a sufficient proof that they were not looked upon as very orthodox, and that they had need to be alter'd agreeably to that which they look'd upon as the model of all others.

If we go from the form of administering the Eucharist, to that of Ordination, we shall discover as little uniformity between the Ordinations of the *Greeks* and the *Latins*, and the Ordination of the *Syrians*, as well *Nestorians* as *Eutychians*, and the *Coptics*, and this without any body's ever disputing the Ordination of all these Sects. As the most able Divines never annex the efficacy of a Sacrament to any particular words exclusive of others, it is not easy to prove wherein the diversity does precisely consist, if it be not in this, that the Prayers are not the same, that the words us'd at the imposition of hands are altogether different, that all the ceremonies of the Ordination have no affinity; and in short, that there is no conformity, unless

unless that in all the Rituals the Grace of the Holy Spirit is pray'd for to descend upon the elected Bishop, in order to make him worthy of his Ministry. One may consult these Rituals in the works of Father *Morin*, and Father *Martin*, which they have published, to satisfy himself that he must own no Ordination in these Churches, or else he must agree that notwithstanding their Separation and Schism, they practis'd a power of drawing up for themselves the rites and forms of their Sacraments, suitably to that which I have propos'd to prove.

In short; no body can doubt but that these Rituals were all posterior to the origin of those Sects, for whose use they were drawn up. For, besides the reasons which we have produc'd in speaking of the consecration of the Eucharist, and which in some measure extend to the forms of Ordination; it is further certain, both by some Names which are mention'd, and by the Rubricks, wherein there is notice taken of Patriarchs, Metropolitans and Archbishops; and by the nature of the rites themselves, which are already sufficiently enlarg'd upon as favouring of primitive simplicity, that these forms were drawn up by those Sects, who only took care to preserve the substance of Ordination; that is to say, the invocation of the holy Spirit, together with imposition of hands, according as it is observ'd in the Church of *England*.

There is reason enough to believe, that what we have observ'd with respect to the Eucharist and Ordination, would be found to hold good as to all the other Sacraments, if we should declare all the rites that are in use in all the Churches of the Christian world; for one may judge by what instances have been produc'd of the *Latin* and *Greek* Churches. Suppose that of Matrimony, or any other Sacrament, he will always find the same variety, and this variety only proves that the authority of each Church is so far extended as to regulate the exterior worship, under which is comprehended the forms of the Sacraments,



or rather the choice of the prayers and expressions proper for the form of each Sacrament.

It ought therefore to be held as a certain truth, that national Churches, at least, are in possession of the power of regulating what concerns the forms of the Sacraments, and prescribing to themselves the formularies and prayers that serve to that end; and that heretical Churches and Schismatics have made use of the same power, without any body's disputing with them.

The proof of this practice arises from the facts which we have produc'd; and to convince a Man that he need not be under any distrust upon this head, he need only reflect, that when ever there was a reunion in agitation between these Sects and the Church of *Rome*, there was no such thing as Ordination insisted upon, or of repealing those particular rites which they us'd in the administration of the Sacraments.

It is true, that in the Liturgies of these Sects, which were publish'd at *Rome*, there were considerable alterations made, but they are not to be imputed to the Church of *Rome*; and all understanding Divines look upon those alterations in no other light, but as wicked attempts of weak Men, who not confining themselves to correct the errors peculiar to those Sects, extended their power to things more indifferent, in which that Church always left an intire liberty. Therefore, a Man ought not to be led away in his judgment concerning the validity or invalidity of forms upon the account of alterations made by the *Roman* censors, experience making it certain, that they propos'd no other view, by their corrections, but to reduce the oriental rites to a nearer affinity with those of the Church of *Rome*, without troubling themselves whether the former were valid or no.

Now from these two facts which carry their own evidence along with them, that is to say, the possession which particular Churches have of a power to regulate

regulate their discipline, their worship, and the form of their Sacraments, and that their Sacraments were not reputed invalid, there are two clear necessary consequences that result from them. The first is, that the Church of *England* is not to be refus'd the exercise of a power of the same nature. The second is, that this power being founded upon possession, and that the Church of *England* not having made use of it but upon the ordinary terms, that is to say, in preserving that which perpetual tradition and uniformity recommended upon this head, a Man cannot tax their Ordinations made since the Schism with invalidity. These two consequences are founded upon the plainest reasoning. For, 1. The Church of *England* is not to be deny'd a power allow'd in the oriental Churches, who are known to have been engag'd in Heresy and Schism. Now, by the facts alledg'd, it is evident, that the oriental Sects exercis'd this power; that their Sacraments were not question'd; that they were not disturb'd in the practice and possession of modelling the form of their worship and discipline, even when their opinions were condemn'd with a great deal of warmth. Therefore the same justice is to be done to the *English*, since their case is the same, and which cannot be refus'd them, without condemning the example of those Churches, who acknowledg'd this right to be invested in the antient Sects.

2. This right being not to be refus'd the Church of *England*, it necessarily follows that her Ordinations are valid: For since, as I have prov'd, her succession is certain; that the alterations, which she made in the form of her Ordination, have respect only to things not essential; that they do not affect the substance of the Sacrament, and that every Church has a right, and is in possession of a power to determine in these cases; with what justice can these Ordinations be reputed invalid which are reiterated only upon the account of false facts, insufficient reasonings, and up-

on pretexts the most frivolous, the most unreasonable in the world ?

To these two consequences (which united together are all the use made of the above-mention'd facts) there are two difficulties objected, which are proper to be discuss'd before this Chapter is finish'd. First it is objected, that it cannot be prov'd that the Liturgies, or the forms of the Sacraments had been drawn up by schismatical Churches, or at least, that those which they us'd may not have been the same with those us'd before in their Churches. But supposing even that these schismatical Churches had compos'd their Liturgies, or the forms of their Sacraments, it may be objected that these facts do not establish a right in favour of such Churches; that all that they do is unlawfully done, because they have neither jurisdiction nor authority; and that by this means all that they do, can give no body any room to conclude that they had a right to do so. This is all that can be colourably objected; but a pretence is not sufficient to satisfy those who seriously search after truth.

In short, as to the first difficulty, it is intirely false, that it cannot be prov'd that schismatical Churches have compos'd Liturgies and Forms for the other Sacraments, or that they never preserv'd those us'd before their Heresy and Schism began. For tho' they did not preserve for us the Liturgies, and an exact account of the antient forms, which serv'd to the administration of the Sacraments, nevertheless the names of their Authors, and the Heresies they slid in, the great diversity between several Liturgies of Churches very near neighbours, the alterations which they successively made, and even the consent of the learned, who agree that the oriental Bishops us'd a very extensive liberty in drawing up their Liturgies, and that they were not compos'd until after the commencement of their Heresies: Is not this as much a proof that these Churches drew up themselves the forms of their Sacraments, as that they did not intirely content themselves

O



themselves with those in use before the Schism, and the birth of their errors? It is therefore false, that it cannot be prov'd that neither Liturgies nor Forms were either compos'd, or alter'd by schismatical Sects; and when that can be prov'd, it is visible that the validity of the *English* Ordinations is no more liable to dispute, than the validity of the Sacraments confer'd by the antient Sects; and that the same reasons which ascertain'd to these Churches the validity of their Liturgies, and of their Forms, authoriz'd the others to make proper alterations in things undetermin'd by *Christ*, which are susceptible of a change.

But these facts, it is objected, do not establish a right; and from what these Churches have done, a Man ought not to conclude that they had a right to act as they did. A poor equivocation; to unriddle it will be to destroy the difficulty. It is an abuse of the word *Right*: As if we pretended to prove, that what is done in an heretical or schismatical Church is lawfully done; whereas, we have declar'd in several places in this Treatise, that what is perform'd by a schismatical Church is unlawfully and irregularly perform'd, as *St. Austin* says. When therefore we say, that these Churches preserve a right to make what changes they judge convenient and necessary, we mean nothing else, but that it is so in their power to vary in things that are not clearly determin'd either by Scripture, or undoubted Tradition, that the changes which they may prescribe, tho' they are contrary to order and subordination, and consequently are done in an irregular and unlawful manner, yet they do not invalidate the Sacraments in which such alterations as these are made.

Now this right understood in this sense, and suppos'd thro' this whole Dissertation, what becomes of the difficulty oppos'd? From what was done, it cannot, say they, be concluded they had a right to do it. This is true, if by right, a lawful right is simply understood, and if a Man will conclude that what is done

done is lawfully done : But if it be concluded simply, that since there has been no objection made to what was done, and that the Sacraments confer'd during the Heresy have been accounted valid, tho' according to the forms drawn up in Schism ; it follows that these Churches had a right to compose, or alter their Liturgies, without making their Sacraments the less valid, for that reason ; this conclusion is just, and invincibly proves the matter of right. Now this is exactly the design drove at in this Chapter, as one may see by the Title of it, and, which fully expresses the purpose of it. *It remains to prove that the Church of England, in making the changes which she did, has done no more than others, and that nothing can be concluded against the validity of the English Ordination, perform'd since the Schism.*

Some body perhaps may say, that the same sort of power is here treated of which is allow'd to national Churches that are Catholicks ; that as to these it is pretended, not only to prove that what they do is valid, but also lawful ; and therefore, in granting to schismatical Churches the same powers with those that are catholick, it follows, that the right allow'd them not only assures them of the validity of their Ordinations, but also of their legitimacy, if I am permitted to explain my self in this manner, of all their variations in matter of Discipline.

To this the answer is easy, that when the schismatical Churches are compar'd with the Catholicks, it is always done with the necessary reserves, nor is it ever enquir'd into what either the one or the other can do lawfully, but only what they can do validly. This is true even with respect to catholick Churches, which one may meet with in several places of this Chapter ; that there are several alterations which they cannot come into lawfully, without the guilt of Schism, and without destroying that Subordination which Churches owe each other, and moreover, which the inferiors owe the superiors ; therefore

there is nothing treated of but the validity of the Sacraments; and the position consider'd in this light will admit of no difficulty; the facts and the reasons equally concurring to prove, that the changes made in the forms of the Sacraments, do not tend to render the Sacraments null, at least, when the substance is not alter'd; and that there is no essential alteration in those offices wherein all is retain'd, that is determin'd by Scripture, or by a manifestly uniform Tradition, whatever alterations have been made in the rites that are added. This is evident by the conduct observ'd with regard to the Baptism administer'd by the *English*, or by mere Calvinists: All the form is alter'd, excepting the invocation of the Holy Trinity; the Prayers, the Unctions, the Exorcisms are all either chang'd or suppress'd; their Baptism is nevertheless receiv'd, and why these contrary steps, these contrary measures as to their Ordinations?

One cannot abridge the power of particular Churches more than I have done; nay, even of those that are Schismatical, without contradicting true antiquity. But tho' it be prov'd that I give too great a latitude as to this power, what can be concluded against the validity of Ordinations made out of the Church? It is agreed, that it is not from a lawful jurisdiction of Churches that a Man is to determine of the validity or invalidity of Sacraments, but from the conservation or suppression of what was always reputed essential; that the changes which affect only the Ceremonies, which are us'd only for the sake of more solemnity, may be retrench'd with the same facility, if we have respect only to the validity: That it is upon this foot that the validity of Baptism, and the other Sacraments is judg'd of, when Heresies and Schisms arise in the Church; and that in short, of what nature soever the power annex'd to the societies separated from the Church may be, yet they preserve enough to administer valid Sacraments, when the matter and essential form is to be met with among them.

These



*of the* English ORDINATIONS. 197

These concessions are more than enough to terminate all our dispute: For, in few words, since the validity or invalidity of a Sacrament depends upon the conservation or omission of what is essential in the matter and form, it follows, that if the Church of *England* has preserv'd what is essential to Ordination, the consecration of her Bishops is valid. Now it has been clearly prov'd, that both with respect to the matter and to the form, all that is essential was preserv'd. It is therefore wrong to insist upon a defect of power in that Church in order to destroy her Ordinations, whereas it has been prov'd, that she exercis'd no power but what other Sects were in possession of. The persons therefore concern'd in this Argument, should have prov'd that she has destroy'd the matter or form of this Sacrament; which is what I have demonstrated she has not done.

---

C H A P. XI.

*An answer to the fourth difficulty. That it was not by the secular, but by the ecclesiastical Authority that the English Ordinal was alter'd.*

Those who are the greatest opposers of the validity of the *English* Ordinations, have hardly touch'd this objection; it may be, because they believe it foreign to our question, or else that they think it of no weight, and of no force against the Church of *England*. But to leave nothing unanswer'd in a matter so important, I think it necessary to consider this difficulty with some attention, which is not so foreign to this subject, but that a Man may draw consequences which have sufficient relation with the principal question.

It is therefore agreed among us that a Church is mistress of her own Discipline, and that she may make

such alterations in it as she thinks convenient. But it is objected that a change made by the secular authority, in things appertaining to the essence of Sacraments, renders them intirely null. Now it is said, that if the cotemporary writers, and the publick Acts of the *English* Reformation are consulted, no body can dispute but that the change of the Ritual was procur'd by the secular authority. So that the authority of the new Ordinal not being founded upon any other than the King's, who approv'd of it; therefore it cannot be said, that it was the Church of *England* that chang'd her antient usages; but it must be granted, that the alterations were made by a secular authority, which could give no sanction to things which it prescrib'd of a spiritual nature; and all that was done in consequence of it, ought to be look'd upon as null; and all the Ordinations, which have no other source, no other principle than this, are in themselves null, and absolutely invalid.

But to make this objection carry some weight, the truth of the fact ought first to be establish'd, which is a thing impossible to be done: For it is manifest, by all the *English* writers, and by the acts of Parliament, that the King and Parliament bore no other part in this affair, but to order the reformation of the *Roman* Pontifical, to cause the Bishops to meet to undertake this matter, and to legalize the alterations which the Bishops and Divines should think fit to make.

This is what we learn from several authors, and among the rest Doctor *Heylin*, *Burnet*, and *Collier*.  
 " There pass'd, says *Heylin* <sup>r</sup>, two acts of especial  
 " consequence (*viz.* in the Parliament of 1549) to  
 " the concernments of Religion. The first declar'd to  
 " this effect: *That such form and manner of making and*  
 " *consecrating Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons and*  
 " *Ministers of the Church, as by six Prelates, and six*  
 " *other learned men of this Realm, learned in God's Law,*  
 " *by the King to be appointed and assign'd, or by the most*

<sup>r</sup> *Heylin's Hist. Reform.* p. 82.

of the English ORDINATIONS. 199

"number of them, shall be devised to that purpose, and set forth under the great Seal, before the first of April next coming, shall be lawfully exercised and used, and no other."

Dr. Burnet <sup>t</sup> agrees in this point with Dr. Heylin : So now, says he, the Reformation was order'd to be carried on : And there being one part of the divine Offices not yet reform'd, that is concerning the giving Orders, some Bishops and Divines, brought now together by a session of Parliament, were appointed to prepare a Book of Ordination — A Bill for the form of ordaining Ministers was brought into the House of Lords, and was agreed to, the Bishops of *Duresme, Carlisle, Worcester, Chichester* and *Westminster* protesting against it. The substance of it was, that such forms of ordaining Ministers as should be set forth by the advice of six Prelates and six Divines, to be named by the King, and authoriz'd by a warrant under the great Seal, should be us'd after *April* next, and no other."

Collier in his *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, gives exactly the very same account, <sup>t</sup> and transcribes the whole act of Parliament which Heylin only gives the substance of ; by which we plainly perceive that the new Ordinal was drawn up by the Bishops and Divines, and not by any secular authority. For, according to Heylin, <sup>u</sup> the Bishops were *Cranmer* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, *Goodrick* Bishop of *Ely*, *Holbeck* Bishop of *Lincoln*, *Day* Bishop of *Chichester*, *Skip* Bishop of *Hereford*, *Thirlby* Bishop of *Westminster*, and *Ridley* Bishop of *Rocheſter*. The Doctors were *Richard Cox*, *May*, *Taylor*, *Haynes*, *Robertson*, and *Ridley* [mistaken for *Redmayne* ;] for *Redmayne* was of the number according to Burnet <sup>x</sup>. And there is no mention made of any layman being concern'd in that affair.

<sup>t</sup> Burnet's *Hist. of Reform.* Vol. 2. p. 140, 141. <sup>u</sup> Collier's *Ecclesiast. Hist.* Vol. 2. p. 244. <sup>v</sup> Heylin's *Hist. of the Reform.* p. 58. <sup>x</sup> Burnet's *Hist. of Reform.* Vol. 2. p. 61.



Moreover, the King and Parliament look'd upon the execution of this order as a thing foreign from their jurisdiction, that the Act which directed the reviewing the book of Ordination, order'd that it should forthwith take place, as soon as it was approv'd by the Bishops, without any further necessity of its being presented to the Parliament, to have a new Act to establish the use and observation of it, as we are told by Doctor Heylin, y " The Bishops and learned " men which are appointed by this Act, (*viz.* for " the drawing up the Office of consecrating, &c.) are " the same whom the King had formerly employ'd in " composing the Liturgy, —and they accordingly apply'd themselves unto the work, following therein " the rules of the primitive Church— which book being finish'd, was made use of without further authority till the year 1552."

In short, the first Act expressly declar'd that there was no necessity for a new Act to establish the new form of Ordination, and that this was sufficient. <sup>z</sup> We it enacted, says this Statute, that such form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, &c. as by six Prelates and six other Men of this Realm, learned in God's Law, by the King's Majesty to be appointed and assign'd, and set forth under the Great Seal of England — shall by virtue of this present Act be lawfully exercised and used.

Is not this a convincing proof, that this was the work of the Clergy? That the secular authority did not intermeddle in this case, only so far, as to see the execution of the Ecclesiastical? That the King did not break in upon any function, which strictly speaking, belong'd to the Bishops? That such is the practice with most Churches, where their Ordinances take place, no further than they are back'd by the regal authority? And, that if the King, in directing this Reformation, exceeded the bounds of his power,

y Heylin's *Hist.* p. 82, 83.

z Collier's *Hist.* Vol. 2. p. 288. the

the execution of the order had nothing in it unlawful in the manner of proceeding?

To elude the force of all these testimonies, it is said that all this was done by the secular authority; that the Bishops were no other than executors of the orders of the King and Parliament; that their determinations had no other effect than what the King gave them by enjoining the observation of the new Ordinal; and that in fine, the title of the head of the Church given to the King, with all the rights which any spiritual power ever had over ecclesiastical Persons and ecclesiastical Affairs, to establish or to reform all that is necessary in the Church, evidently proves, that the ministry of the Bishops was here only us'd for form, and had nothing of authority in it; but that all was done in virtue of the Prince's authority, and by his order, as the Act of Parliament of the year 1535 proves; wherein it is said, <sup>a</sup> "That the King and his Heirs, and Successors, shall be reputed the only supreme head in Earth of the Church of *England*, and shall enjoy all honours, dignities, preeminencies, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits and commodities to the said dignity belonging and appertaining; and also that he shall have full power and authority from time to time to visit, repress, redress, reform all such errors, heresies, abuses and offences, which by any manner of spiritual authority ought, or may be lawfully reform'd," &c. This Statute was renew'd by the first Parliament held under Queen *Elizabeth*, <sup>b</sup> in the first year of her reign, and which laid the foundation of all her proceedings, and that of all her successors with respect to ecclesiastical Affairs. Now it is plain by this Statute, that all the spiritual authority is devolv'd to the King, that it is lodg'd in him as in its spring or fountain; and that being invested with all other spiritual power, he is reputed lawfully to have a right to exercise spiritual

<sup>a</sup> *The Statutes at large*, Tom. I. p. 436.  
<sup>b</sup> *Statutes at large*, Ib. p. 768.

functions,

functions, and to communicate the power to others, he having the fullness of it as sovereign head of the Church of *England*, as well in Spirituals as Temporals.

This power which the Parliaments have allow'd the Kings of *England* is not lodg'd any where else in the exercise of it. We find, as 'tis said in the pieces publish'd by *Burnet*, commissions given by the Prince to visit Churches, and these commissions are sometimes executed by mere Laymen, and Ordinances made in a matter purely spiritual; one sees powers given to preach and to administer the Sacraments, and also a revocation of these powers; and in a word, these Princes have annex'd to their own person both the regal and sacerdotal powers, and they have usurp'd a power which other Princes never enjoy'd before them, and which one would think incompatible since the publication of Christianity.

This, without doubt, is what may be said of most force against the authority of the new Bishops, who have not, as is pretended, any other mission but from the Prince. It is to be consider'd whether the fact be thus or no. I agree in the first place with some *English* Divines, such as Archbishop *Bramhall* and several others, <sup>c</sup> that the power of the Kings of *England* is too extensive in spiritual matters, that the title of supreme head of the Church of *England* in spirituals and temporals, has somewhat in it odious, and even scandalous; that a title of the like kind is a thing unheard of in the Church; and that a Man cannot, without Prevarication and Schism, attribute to him all the rights, priviledges and jurisdictions that ever appertain'd to any spiritual power. Such an allowance as this ought to give no suspicion that I approve, in any degree, a change made in this respect in the Church of *England*.

When all is said, does it follow that in *England*, the King is look'd upon as the source of spiritual power?

<sup>c</sup> *Bramhall's Works*, p. 1001.



When does he of himself exercise ecclesiastical functions, and when in all things substitute a right in spiritual powers, and take to himself a spiritual jurisdiction? These are consequences very much disavow'd by the *English* Divines, by the Kings themselves, and by all the Clergy.

In 1562, the Bishops assembled at *London*, drew up some articles in their Convocation, which they thought necessary to establish an uniformity of faith and discipline in their Church; and behold what is said in the 37<sup>th</sup> Article, <sup>d</sup> "Whereas we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief Government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous Folks to be offended; we give not to our Princes the ministring either of God's word, or of the Sacraments, the which thing the injunctions also lately set forth by *Elizabeth* our Queen, do most plainly testify: But that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy Scripture by God himself, that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil Sword the stubborn and evil doers." Two years afterwards, this article was ratified by the Convocation of the Province of *York*, and was also allow'd of by the whole Nation. It was confirm'd anew in 1571, by the Clergy, and consequently authoris'd by the Queen, by which she limited her power to functions purely external, to maintain the ecclesiastical Discipline.

In 1603, a new Convocation of the whole Province of *Canterbury* was held at *London*, which Synod was approv'd and ratified by King *James* the First. The second Canon treats of the King's Supremacy in the Church of *England*, but there is nothing said of any spiritual Function that the Prince could exercise. <sup>e</sup> "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the King's

<sup>d</sup> Sparrow's *Collection of Articles*, p. 221.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid p. 346.

" Majesty

“ Majesty hath not the same authority in causes ec-  
 “ clestical, that the godly Kings had among the  
 “ Jews and Christian Emperors in the primitive  
 “ Church, or impeach any part of his regal Supre-  
 “ macy in the said causes, restored to the Crown,  
 “ and by the laws of this Realm therein establish’d,  
 “ let him be *ipso facto* excommunicated.” In the  
 Synod of the year 1640, held under *Charles* the First,  
 § wherein the extent of the King’s power as to what  
 regards the Church is explain’d at large ; all consists  
 in the submission of ecclesiastical Persons to him ex-  
 clusive of a submission to any foreign power, that is  
 to say to the *Pope*, and in giving him a power to as-  
 semble and dissolve Convocations, and to use the ci-  
 vil Sword, that is to say external power to retain Ec-  
 clesticicks, as well as others, within the bounds of  
 submission and duty.

Queen *Elizabeth* in her injunctions of the year 1559,  
 § hath herself disavow’d all the spiritual power attri-  
 buted to her, and confines herself to hinder that no  
 other independent spiritual Authority should be re-  
 ceiv’d in her Kingdom : For she declares, that by the  
 Oath of Supremacy, she does not pretend to assume  
 any power or authority in the exercise of the eccle-  
 siastical Ministry ; that she requir’d nothing more, but  
 that her Subjects would acknowledge her sovereign  
 Authority over all persons as well Ecclesiastical as  
 Laics in her Realm, and that no foreign Power had  
 any authority over them : For see how she says,  
 “ The Queen’s Majesty being inform’d that in cer-  
 “ tain places of the Realm, sundry of her native Sub-  
 “ jects, being called to ecclesiastical Ministry of the  
 “ Church, by sinister persuasion and perverse con-  
 “ struction, be induced to find some scruple in the  
 “ form of an Oath, which by an Act of the last Par-  
 “ liament is prescribed— And further her Majesty  
 “ forbiddeth all manner her Subjects to give ear or  
 “ credit to such perverse and malicious Persons,

§ Ibid. p. 346.

§ Ibid. p. 83.

“ which most sinisterly and maliciously labour to no-  
 “ tify to her loving Subjects, how by the words of  
 “ the said Oath it may be collected, that the Kings  
 “ and Queens of this Realm— may challenge autho-  
 “ rity and power of Ministry of divine Service in the  
 “ Church— her Majesty neither doth, nor ever will  
 “ challenge any authority than that was challeng’d,  
 “ and lately us’d by the said Noble Kings of famous  
 “ Memory, *Henry the eighth and Edward the sixth*,  
 “ which is, and was of ancient time due to the Im-  
 “ perial Crown of this Realm, that is, under God, to  
 “ have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of  
 “ Persons born within these her Realms—of what  
 “ estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal soever they  
 “ be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to  
 “ have any superiority over them ; and if any shall  
 “ accept the Oath with this Interpretation— her  
 “ Majesty is well pleased to accept every such in  
 “ that behalf as her good and obedient Subjects, and  
 “ shall acquit them of all manner of Penalties con-  
 “ tain’d in the said Acts, &c.

*James the first* is yet more express, because both in his apology for the Oath of Allegiance, and in his admonition to Princes, he declares, that he does not pretend by that Oath to assume any other than a superiority in matters civil and temporal. <sup>h</sup> *Visum itaque è re esse, ut hujusmodi jusjurandi apologiam ederem, in quâ suscipiebam probandum nihil in eo contineri, nisi quod ad obedientiam merè civilem ac temporalem spectat, qualis summis Principibus à Subditis debetur.* This is what he repeats in several other places, and which clearly proves that nothing is less real than the attributing of spiritual power to the Kings of *England*. It is true, that the Acts of Parliament of 1535, and of 1559, seem to give the King somewhat more ; but the Clergy and the Kings themselves presently restrain’d the sense, and signify’d that these Acts meant no more than to declare, that the King had a supream autho-

<sup>h</sup> Jacob. 1. Opera p. 289.



rity over the ecclesiasticks of his Kingdom as well as over others, and that the Subjects of his Realm ought not to submit to any other power. It is a piece of injustice to strain the terms so rigorously, without any regard given to the sense put upon them by their proper Interpreters. For this interpretation is to be regarded as the only sense of the Law; that the *English* Divines do not otherwise explain the supremacy of the King, and his authority in matters ecclesiastical and spiritual, than in subjecting all ecclesiastical Persons unto him, exclusive of any other power, and in making him to employ his power in the maintenance of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church.

“<sup>i</sup> Now this regal Authority, says the Author of the *Politie of the Church*, &c. in the Church of *England* is commonly call’d Ecclesiastical, not because  
 “ its immediate end or effect is spiritual, for it is the  
 “ prerogative of Priests by the Ministry of the Word  
 “ and Sacraments, to examine into the consciences of  
 “ Men, and to sanctify them by the co-operation  
 “ of the Holy Ghost; neither is it ecclesiastical upon  
 “ the account of the manner of its being exercis’d a-  
 “ bout Holy Things; for it does not assume the ex-  
 “ ercise of these functions by publick preaching, by  
 “ administering to the faithful, by pronouncing the  
 “ sentence of Excommunication, as having the power

<sup>i</sup> Jam hæc regia potestas in Ecclesia Anglicana usitatè nominatur Ecclesiastica, non quod proximus ejus finis seu immediatus effectus sacer sit & spiritualis, cum peculiaris Presbyterorum prærogativa sit divini verbi & sacramentorum ministerio penetrare in hominum animas, illasque spiritu co-operante sanctificare; neque ecclesiastica est ratione modi secundum quem circa res sacras occupatur, illas enim minimè præstat fartas rectas, de iis concionando, eas propriis manibus fidei populo distribuendo, excommunicationis sententiam tanquam clavium habens potestatem pronuntiando, sed hanc tantum decernendo (sicut Theodosius junior & Valentinianus in Codice Justiniano sanxerunt ut Nestoriani anathematizentur) & externâ pœnarum civilium vi prophanos hujus censuræ & istarum rerum violatores coercendo. Doct. & Polit. Ecc. Anglic. cap. 3. p. 25.

of the Keys; but this power only takes place (as *Theodosius* the younger and *Valentinian* in the *Justinian* Code, ordain'd that the *Nestorians* should be anathematiz'd) in appointing by the external force of civil Penalties that the prophane Invaders of this Authority should be subject to co-ercion and restraint." Behold what regards the King's Authority!" And, as to the Supremacy, observe what the same author makes it to consist in. <sup>k</sup> "The Church of *England* acknowledges the supreme power, as power, which is not to be understood of ordering ecclesiastical persons and causes in an arbitrary way, but as having in its own district a pre-eminence over all Magistrates, and is free from all compulsion of temporal punishments, and in this respect is only subject to God."

The learned *Mr. Mason*, in his defence of the Church of *England*, gives the King no other power than what we are a speaking of; <sup>l</sup> "The external Government only is given by God to the King; God gives not the power of administering the word and Sacraments to Kings, but to Priests." This is what he again explains more fully, when he says that the King's jurisdiction does not consist in the exercise of any ecclesiastical or sacerdotal function, but barely in an authority to support the execution of the Laws, and to see that they are observed. <sup>m</sup> "*Jurisdictio Regia non sita est in potestate aliqua sacerdotali, aut in personali alicujus ecclesiasticæ functionis administratione, sed in auctoritate quadam externâ, suprema illa quidem quæ in imperando cernitur, quæque delinquentes pœnis civilibus ex-*

<sup>k</sup> Auctoritatem agnoscit Anglicana Ecclesia supremam, qua potestatem, ut statuat de personis & causis ecclesiasticis pro suo arbitratu minimè intelligit, sed infra suas ditiones præeminentiam super omnes Magistratus ab omni temporalium pœnarum coactione liberam, solique Deo hac ratione subditam, *ibid.*—

<sup>l</sup> Externum duntaxat regimen Regi à Deo est demandatum; verbi & sacramentorum administratio non Regibus, sed sacerdotibus cœlitus est concessa. *Vind. Eccl. Angl. l. 4. c. 2. p. 429.*

<sup>m</sup> *Ibid. c. 1. p. 420.*

*ternè coercet.* It is in this sense he again says that the supremacy and jurisdiction attributed to the King is ecclesiastical, objectively only, and not formally, because of himself he cannot exercise any spiritual function, but only direct and maintain the doctrine and discipline by his Laws, and see that these functions are perform'd by the Ecclesiasticks. " " It is not for Christian Princes to administer the Word and Sacraments, to ordain or excommunicate; but to them it belongs as supreme Governors over all persons and in all causes within their dominions to order, in virtue of the royal authority, and to take care that all these things are perform'd by proper persons, by such as God has appointed to execute these holy offices. " " The power of the Prince, his jurisdiction and governing capacity in spiritual affairs, is only spiritual as to the object, but he has no formal power, because it is not concern'd in this affair in a spiritual manner, that is in preaching, in administering the Sacraments; but in a civil sense, that is, by establishing Laws to protect these administrations: Neither does he restrain delinquents by virtue of the spiritual sword of excommunication, but only by the civil and material sword."

Archbishop *Bramhall* expresses this yet more clearly. P " The Kings of *England*, says he, are indeed in our Laws called the supreme heads of the Church within their dominions. But how? Not spiritual

n Christianis Regibus verbum & sacramenta administrare, ordinare, excommunicare fas non est; ad eosdem tamen tanquam ad supremos omnium personarum in omnibus causis intra suas conditiones gubernatores, spectat autoritate regiâ jubere, & curare ut hæc omnia à talibus personis administrantur, quales ad hæc sacra munera obeunda designavit Dominus ibid. " Principis potestas, jurisdictio vel gubernatio in rebus spiritualibus, est spiritualis objectivè tantum, non formaliter---quia non versatur circa hoc objectum modo spirituali, id est prædicando, vel Sacramenta ministrando, sed civili, nempe leges sanciendo; neque delinquentes coercet gladio excommunicationis spirituali, sed tantum civili & materiali. Ibid. c. 2. p. 433. P *Bramhall's Works*, p. 1001, and p. 134.

" heads,



“ heads, nor yet ecclesiastical heads; so as *S. N.* need  
 “ not fear our deriving our orders from them; but  
 “ civil heads by an influence of coercive or corrobora-  
 “ tory power, by applying or subtracting the mat-  
 “ ter, by regulating the exercise, by punishing the  
 “ delinquencies of ecclesiastical judges: That is as  
 “ much as to say, as supreme governours, as *Saul* is  
 “ called the head of the tribes of *Israel*, yea of the  
 “ tribe of *Levi* among the rest, &c.” And elsewhere  
 he says, “ Neither do we draw or derive any spiri-  
 “ tual jurisdiction from the crown; but either liberty  
 “ and power to exercise actually and lawfully, upon  
 “ the subjects of the crown, that habitual jurisdiction  
 “ which we receiv’d at our Ordination.—In sum, we  
 “ hold our benefices from the crown, but our offices  
 “ from Christ. The King doth nominate us, but  
 “ Bishops do ordain us.—The confounding of those  
 “ two distinct Acts, that is, Nomination or Elec-  
 “ tion, with Ordination or Consecration, hath be-  
 “ got many mistakes in the world, &c.”

Whatever inclinations *Burnet* Bishop of *Salisbury* had  
 for the Presbyterians, yet he does not explain himself  
 differently as to the power of the King in spiritual  
 matters. “ The power of the King, says he, in ec-  
 “ clesiastical matters among us, is expressed in this  
 “ article (37) under those reserves, and with that  
 “ moderation, that no just scruple can lye against it;  
 “ and it is that which all the Kings, even of the *Roman*  
 “ communion, do assume, and in some places with a  
 “ much more unlimited authority. The methods of  
 “ managing it may differ a little, yet the power is the  
 “ same, and is built on the same foundations.—In the  
 “ strictest sense, as the *Head* communicates vital influ-  
 “ ence to the whole body, Christ is the only *head* of  
 “ his Church;—but as *head* may in a figure stand for  
 “ the fountain of order and government, of protection

<sup>a</sup> *Burnet's Exposition of the 39 Articles*, p. 387, or 359.

“and conduct, the King or Queen may well be called the head of the Church.”

Doctor Brett<sup>r</sup>, not to mention an infinite number of others, also maintains in his *defence of Episcopacy*, that the appointment of the Prince is insufficient without episcopal consecration; that the Ordination of Bishops is necessary to the validity of the Sacraments; that no necessity can authorize the Laity without the mission and authority of the Bishops to administer them; and that Princes cannot without Sacrilege assume to themselves a power of this kind.

At present I ask if the Ordinances of Parliament, which attribute to the King a spiritual jurisdiction, interpreted in the sense that the Kings themselves, the Synods of the Bishops, and particular Divines interpret them, are sufficient to persuade any body that the King is the center of the spiritual authority; that is to say, that he has united in his own person the regal and the sacerdotal authority, and that the Bishops derive from him all their power in the government of the Church? All that can be concluded more than this, is that the Kings have reserv'd to themselves a part of the exterior jurisdiction, which before was altogether lodg'd in the Bishops.

This is also what I never saw contested, and this is all that the commissions prove which were granted by *Henry the eighth*, and *Edward the sixth*, to visit Churches; the powers given to Bishops or Curates to preach out of their own dioceses or parishes; the orders given the Bishops to admit such and such persons to exercise ecclesiastical functions; the Laws publish'd in matters spiritual; and in a word, all that is alledg'd to establish the spiritual power of the Kings of *England*: For in what manner, or in what sense soever these records are interpreted, one can never find that these Princes did any thing more than incroach upon the external ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and not

<sup>r</sup> Doctor Brett's *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, p. 56, 61, 95, 346.

of the English ORDINATIONS. 211

that they perform'd any function proper to the Priesthood, or that could be reputed an action purely sacerdotal.

This is what Archbishop *Bramhall* judiciously observes; and besides, according to him, the Statute<sup>f</sup> which attributes all these powers to the Prince, ought not to be imputed to the Church of *England*, since that *Henry the eighth* was not then a Protestant. And further there is room enough to think that the Parliament who allow'd him this spiritual authority, extended it no further than the exercise of an exterior ecclesiastical jurisdiction. It is true that *Cromwell* was invested with the power of a Legat or a Commissioner in chief by *Henry the eighth*, with an authority to nominate other Commissioners as the High Chancellors do. "But the Kings of *England*, says he, never grant Commissions of that nature to one single Layman, how dear soever he be; but conjointly to him with others of maturity of judgment, of dexterity and skill in the Laws, and also qualify'd by their callings (that is to say Ecclesiasticks) to act by excommunication or absolution according to the exigence of the matter. In brief, *Henry the eighth* did not impart holy orders nor habitual jurisdiction, but constituted delegates by his commission, to hear appeals, to see justice administred."

This appears to me so much the more evident, because the same Parliament<sup>u</sup> which gave the King a cognizance and decision in spiritual matters, did not hinder the King to go to the Archbishop of *Canterbury* to have the necessary dispensations; which proves that in granting the King a spiritual authority, it was not intended to derogate from the necessity of an ecclesiastical Ministry, and that there was no more allow'd the King than an exterior direction, and a right to examine whether Ecclesiasticks acquitted

<sup>f</sup> *Bramhal's Works*, p. 337.  
large, tom. 1. p. 427.

<sup>t</sup> *Ibid.* p. 1001.

<sup>u</sup> *Stat. at*



themselves according to the Duties of their Profession.

It is therefore certain, according to the *English* Divines, that all these commissions are ordinarily executed by Ecclesiasticks, as the author of the *Politie of the Church of England* observes; \* *Cujus autoritatis exercitium ordinariè quibusdam Commissariis ecclesiasticis, inter quos duo Archiepiscopi solent esse primi, mandat, ad ordinariam Episcoporum & Archidiaconorum jurisdictionem, ubi deficit, supp'endam & corroborandam.* That the Bishops esteem'd their mission to be of divine right, and that they did not believe themselves indebted for it to the King: † “There ought to be Bishops in the Church, says King *James the first*, as an apostolical institution, and therefore their Ordination was always look'd upon as divine.” That tho' they were chosen by the King, yet they had their mission from nothing except their consecration, which they received from no body but the Bishops. ‡ *Sunt episcopi per consecrationem; ergo dum consecrantur, jurisdictionem accipiunt—Ecce tibi Ecclesia Anglicana non modò munus ministeriale in genere, sed etiam disciplinae administrationem in specie, id est jurisdictionis potestatem, mediante consecratione, tribuit.* That the King can neither by himself nor by another, exercise the spiritual authority annex'd to Ordination, but barely depute Ministers capable to exercise this exterior jurisdiction. § *Aliquando significat auctoritatem illam internam in ordinatione acceptam, à quâ tanquam à causâ actiones ministeriales habent ut sint ratae ac validae; & hanc Principes saeculares nec ipsi habent, nec exercere vel conferre possunt. Aliquando externam tantùm facultatem seu licentiam munus ministeriale legitimè ordinatione collatum exequendi denotat; & hanc Reges ministris doctis & piis conferre & possunt & debent, ut Augustino Ethelbertus.*

\* *Polit. Eccles. Anglic. c. 3. p. 22. & descrip. jur. Eccl. Sect. 2. p. 122.* † *Jac. I. opera, p. 304.* ‡ *Masoni Vind.*

*Ecc. Angl. lib. 4. c. 2. p. 423.*

§ *Ibid. c. 2. p. 430.*

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 213

It is this second kind of jurisdiction, as we have seen, that the *English* Divines allow the King; but as to the first, they all with one voice deny him to have any such authority. <sup>b</sup> *Hanc potestatem, jurisdictionem, seu gubernationem universam, ad solam Ecclesiam spectare, & non ad Principem, omnes uno quasi ore affirmamus.* But when I speak of all the *English* Divines, I mean all those that adhere to the doctrine of that Church; for as to the Presbyterians I know very well that they are of other principles; so that the Kings of *England* acted upon the principles of these latter, if they have sometimes attributed to themselves a power purely spiritual, <sup>c</sup> when they abas'd Episcopacy, even so far as to cause the Bishops to be cited before Lay-visitors supported by the King's commission; when these commissioners exceeded in their powers, so far as to pronounce sentences of excommunication in virtue of the King's spiritual authority; and, in short, the preaching of the word and the administration of the Sacraments excepted, they have executed by Lay-visitors all that belongs to the jurisdiction of Bishops, and which is inherent in their character.

But it is not from these proceedings, disavow'd by the Church of *England*, that a Man ought to judge of the form and nature of the King's power. At the beginning of the *English* Reformation, a numerous party of Presbyterians were in credit with these Princes, by the chief places which they held both in Church and State; and they often proceeded extravagantly in what they did; and it is not at all surprising that under *Henry* the eighth, and again it is less so under *Edward* the sixth, and the beginning of *Queen Elizabeth's* reign, that these Princes assum'd to themselves rights which belong'd only to the Bishops. But we have seen that by the synodical Acts, and even by

<sup>b</sup> Masoni Vind. Eccl. Angl. p. 433.

<sup>c</sup> Burnet, part. 2.

p. 26. 400. and Records, lib. 1. n. 7. & l. 3. n. 7. Collier, part. 2. p. 436.

214 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

the consent of *Elizabeth* and *James the first*, that they did not pretend to any other spiritual function, but that of a power to exert the Laws for the good government of the Church, and to corroborate by their authority what the Bishops do, and to keep the Ecclesiasticks as well as Laicks in a due submission to the Prince; to obstruct any foreign jurisdiction, and to have, by themselves or by their Deputes, a general inspection over the doctrine and discipline, to hinder an innovation in any thing without their authority; and in fine, to conserve the orders which were establish'd by Law.

So that neither the example of *Cromwell* under *Henry the eighth*, nor that of the Duke of *Somerset* under *Edward the sixth*, nor that of some other Lords in the reign of *Elizabeth*, even when consider'd in the most disadvantageous light, are to be produced as instances; because these were extravagant proceedings contrary to all rules, and against which the canons of the Synod of *London* were drawn up, and approved by Queen *Elizabeth* herself, and since confirm'd by all the Clergy and all their Kings. All that can be insinuated more as to these excesses is, that the Bishops cannot acquire or confer any lawful jurisdiction in a Church where the King has usurp'd such a jurisdiction. But how can it be proved from this, that all that they do in the administration of the Sacraments is null and invalid? This is what appears impossible: So that M. *P'Abbe Renaudot* did not insist much upon a difficulty which he saw very well would be of no use in the defence of his cause; and indeed we do not see how the nullity of an Ordination can be prov'd, which is perform'd by consecrated Bishops, and wherein nothing essential is omitted.

For when it is allowed that the Ordinal was alter'd by the King and Parliament, it is sufficient to take away all scruple concerning the validity of the Ordinations, to know that in the consent of the Parliament that of the Clergy is included, the Bishops being no-  
ted



ted Members of that illustrious body; and what ecclesiastical Laws are there propos'd, are beforehand debated of by the Clergy; for that assembly does no more in *England* than what our Kings do in *France*; that is to say, when he affixes the seal of his royal authority to the ecclesiastical canons, in order to sustain them by the protection of the Laws; for perhaps they might be neglected, if the publick authority did not procure their execution.

Therefore let them insist as much as they please, that the new Bishops were ordain'd contrary to Law, that they are altogether irregular, both as to their election and their ordination; that the Princes, by their usurpations upon the rights of the Bishops, have destroy'd their mission by making themselves in a manner the center and principle of it; in a word, that they have made such a confusion in the Church and Ministry, that they have by this means rais'd a rational doubt of the validity of their Ordinations. I agree that there was disorder and confusion, but as to the doubt there is no ground at all for it, when there is such evident proofs that the Ordination was perform'd by Bishops duly consecrated; and that every thing was observ'd which may be reputed essential to this Sacrament; and this appears to be demonstrated so as to leave no possibility for a Reply.

*The End of the First* PART.

---

A  
 DEFENCE  
 OF THE  
 VALIDITY  
 OF THE  
*English* ORDINATIONS, &c.

---

PART II.

---

CHAP. XII.

*An Answer to the fifth difficulty: The doubts of the Divines, who look upon the English Ordinations as null, are not sufficient to make them dubious, nor consequently invalid.*

**A**FTER all the proofs which we have produc'd of the succession of the Bishops in the Church of *England*, and of the conformity of the new Ritual with the *Roman* Pontifical, as to the substance of it; it would be very hard not to allow that the validity of the *English* Ordinations can be clearly made out; so that the most moderate content themselves with saying, that as to the truth of the thing, it is not to all intents and purposes

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 217

poses evident that these Ordinations are null, but yet that notwithstanding the proofs produc'd, there still remains a reasonable doubt, which as long as it subsists, the Ordination ought to be reiterated; for according to the Maxim of St. *Leo*, that cannot be said to be reiterated, which one cannot prove to be done.

<sup>d</sup> *Quod non ostenditur gestum, ratio non finit ut videatur iteratum.*

This is all that *Champney* insists upon, and since him several other Divines, to prove that the Ordinations made by King *Edward's* Ritual are null, and that they cannot subsist; for, says he, an Ordination founded only upon a probability is invalid, forasmuch as this opinion is grounded only upon a mere probability; and where there is another more probable, and a Bishop who is no more than probably a Bishop, he is really none at all. <sup>e</sup> *Ordinatio tantum probabilis, vel quæ probabiliter tantum sufficiens est & valida, constituit Episcopum tantum probabilem, vel qui probabilitate tantum est Episcopus---sed qui est tantum probabiliter Episcopus, non est validè sufficienterque in Episcopali gradu & potestate constitutus, neque veram habet vocationem Episcopalem. Nam vera validaque potestas, seu vocatio Episcopalis, non est tantum probabilis, sed certa & indubitata.*

Now, according to *Champney*, the English Ordinations cannot be look'd upon as certain, but barely probable, as well upon the account of *Barlow's* Consecration, which there is no manner of certainty of, and also because of the Ordinal it self, which is assuredly less probable than the Pontifical which was abolish'd. Since therefore these Ordinations can be reputed no more than probable, there is nothing else to be done than to reiterate them, because that in the matter of a Sacrament, a Man is oblig'd, under the penalty of a nullity, to take the surest side. <sup>f</sup> *Qui ergo in sacris ordinibus conferendis notam, certam, atque uni-*

<sup>d</sup> *Leo. Mag. Ep. 2.*

<sup>e</sup> *De Vocat. Minist. c. 13. p. 424.*

<sup>f</sup> *Ibid. p. 425.*



*versaliter receptam materiam & formam reliquerit, aliaque quæ tantum probabilis est uteretur, non solum temeritatem sacrilegam committeret, sed etiam eandem actionem usitatam & indubitatam, materiam & formam adhibendo, sub conditione saltem repetere teneretur; quandoquidem probabile saltem est, quod in priori actione nihil fecerit.*

Tho' this difficulty has confounded several Divines, it is nevertheless more amusing than solid; for a doubt ought to influence practice no further than it is founded upon undoubted facts, and upon reasonable principles; for, as St. Leo observes, to make a doubt allowable, so as to justify the reiteration of a Sacrament, there must be no proof or testimony that can assure us of the truth of the thing, whereof we have some room to doubt. *§ Utrum nemo sit penitus, says this Father, qui testimonio suo juvare possit ignorantiam nescientis.* It must be so that there be no evidence among them that are of their familiarity to instruct them in the truth of the facts that are dubious. *h Si nulla existant indicia inter propinquos & familiares, inter clericos atque vicinos.*

But in the present question, nothing is less solid than the principles, and nothing less certain than the facts upon which the pretended doubt is founded; for it is evident from the objection, that this doubt has no other foundation than the uncertainty of Barlow's Consecration, and the novelty of the Ordinal us'd upon this occasion. Now by what has been said before, it is easy to prove that there is nothing in these two points whereon to build a reasonable doubt; and that on the contrary we have domestick testimonies more than enough to ascertain the facts which they would willingly make us doubt of, and consequently the difficulty falls of itself.

For 1. As to the novelty of the Ordinal, it is very certain that it can be no foundation for a reasonable scruple. In short, if the difficulty in question is judg'd

§ Leo Mag. Ep. 135.

h Leo Mag. Ep. 2.

of by the Suffrage of the Divines who have disputed upon this subject, one cannot look upon the opinion of those as barely probable, who make the matter and form of Ordination consist merely in the imposition of hands, and the prayer that accompanies it; nevertheless this sentiment appears demonstrable and certain, when it comes to be decided by the number and quality of the proofs. If you ask the reason, the learned father *Morinus*, in few words, supplies one in this passage; "You may demand, and that justly, why I am of this opinion; it is because it is certain, plain, and allowed of by all. Those things do not belong to the substance of the Sacrament which the *Greeks* never used, nor the *Latins*, but a few centuries back." It is therefore not true, that the new Ordinal, us'd from *Edward* the sixth's time, is no more than probable; and it is yet less true, that it may be less probably valid than the other: For an Ordinal founded upon Scripture and Tradition, cannot, without error, be reputed less probable than another which one knows to be modern, and whose date is in a manner, to use the expression, fix'd. Now such is the imposition of hands, and prayer join'd to it, which all the learned regard as making the sole essence of this Sacrament; and these are preserved in the *English* Ordinal. For as the learned *Habert* Bishop of *Vabre* very well observes, <sup>k</sup> "Whatever the sign be which the holy Scripture has express'd, in mentioning of any

<sup>i</sup> Interrogabis & meritò, qua ratione id judico: Certâ, facili, & ab omnibus concessâ: Ea enim ad substantiam sacramenti non pertinent, quæ Græci nunquam usurparunt, nec multis sæculis Latini. *Morinus de Pœn.* l. 8. c. 18. p. 568.

<sup>k</sup> Quodcumque Symbolum est, quod quidem solum scriptura sacra expressit in alicujus Sacramenti mentione faciendâ, illud revera modis omnibus—huic sacramento intrinsecum ac essenziale est. Quotiescumque verò in scriptura fit mentio ordinis sacramentalis, non alio Symbolo, non aliâ notâ, non aliâ ceremoniâ quam manuum impositione designatur—Scripturæ igitur ordinatio aut nihil est, aut manûs impositio est. *Haberti Lib. Pontif. Eccles. Gr.* p. 120.

220 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

“ Sacrament, that only in all respects is intrinsic and  
 “ essential to that Sacrament ; but as often as the Sa-  
 “ crament of Order is mentioned in Scripture, it is  
 “ express’d by no other sign, by no other notes, by  
 “ no other ceremonies, than imposition of hands—  
 “ Scriptural Ordination is therefore a Nonentity, or it  
 “ is imposition of hands.” This also is the manner that  
*F. Goar*, *M. Hallier*, and all those who have written  
 upon this subject, express themselves.

Is it then the novelty of the form that gives most weight to the doubt in question ? But as to that, there ought to be no great difficulty : For as we have seen with respect to forms not determin’d by scripture, it is in the power of each Church to express the manner as it appears to her most agreeable ; and the only thing essential is, that she should express the end and effect of the Sacrament, as the same Bishop of *Vabre* expresses it. <sup>1</sup> *In sacramentis, quorum materia & forma in scripturis expressa non est, supponendum planè Christum utramque in genere solum Apostolis instituisse, relictâ Ecclesiæ potestate eas variis modis, ut liberet, designandi, constituendi ac determinandi, dummodò præcipuum institutionis caput, intentio scopusque servetur, ac generalis quædam aptitudo & analogia ad significandum sacramenti effectum, gratiam & characterem. Quæ quidem analogia par omnino est & integra in utroque ritu Romano & Græco.* Now this analogy will be found to have been observ’d in the new *English* Ordinal, with the same exactness as in the *Roman* Pontifical, which any body may be convinc’d of upon comparing, as it is easy to do, the one with the other. Where then is there room for a doubt ?

If the form of this Sacrament consisted in certain words, which were in themselves essential, and that these words were not to be met with in the *English* Ordinal, there would then be some reason to suspect that this Sacrament was intirely null. But where is it

<sup>1</sup> *Haberti Lib. Pontif. Eccles. Gr. p. 125.*



found that these words have been determin'd, save only in the writings of some Schoolmen, who frequently, as *Morinus* judiciously observes, make the essence of a Sacrament to consist in that which is no more than a mere ceremony? <sup>m</sup> *Contingit autem aliquando eorum aliquos à vero tam immaniter aberrare, ut in Ritu Romano ea pro solis materiis, & formis adnotent, quæ ad sacramenti tantum solemnitatem & significationis ampliationem spectant.* These words therefore not having been determin'd, and even having varied according to the circumstances of times and places, it is impossible to affix the substance of Ordination to the forms of Prayer of one Church more than to those of another, when both the one and the other come up to the spirit of the institution. The practice of the Church justifies it, and is so far from authorizing the scruple, that it tends only to destroy it; since it is evident by the practice of all Churches, that this is not annex'd to one form more than another; so that it is no solid reason to doubt of the *English* Ordinations, whose Prayers perfectly answer the end, the effect, and the nature of this Sacrament, which is all that Divines require in the like case: *Dummodò præcipuum institutionis caput, intentio scopusque servetur, ac generalis quædam aptitudo & analogia ad significandum sacramenti effectum, gratiam & characterem.*

Therefore it is not the novelty of the Ordinal that can give a handle for such a doubt as this, unless it be suppos'd that tho' the Ordinal has nothing blameable in it, yet the want of authority, in the Church that introduc'd it, is sufficient to render it invalid. But we have prov'd in the tenth Chapter, by the practice of the Church, and by principles that are incontestable, that the different ways of expressing the forms of the Sacraments, are a matter of pure discipline, which every Church has a right to draw up for herself: That tho' in important points no Church

<sup>m</sup> *Morinus de Pœniten. lib. 8. cap. 18. p. 568.*

is permitted to change her forms to the destruction of peace and good order; yet such an alteration does not make the Sacrament invalid; that an heretical or a schismatical Church does not lose by her Heresy and her Schism a power to make alterations of this kind; that the Sacraments are not to be look'd upon as null which she administers, even when the forms are drawn up in the interval of the Heresy or Schism: In a word, nothing but the corruption of the matter and form, can make a Sacrament be reputed invalid.

We have elsewhere prov'd in the sixth Chapter, and in those following it, that the substance of the form was not in the least alter'd in King *Edward's* Ordinal; that in the prayers of the Ordination, excepting some mystical and figurative expressions which are retrench'd, all is retain'd that can relate to the effect of the Sacrament, and to the duties of the ministry; that the Holy Ghost is invoc'd; that he is prayed to in the behalf of the Minister, to fill him with all the Graces necessary for the performance of his function; that even those forms are retain'd which cannot be look'd upon as essential, so careful were they not to make any changes too considerable; that the different orders of the Hierarchy are exactly distinguish'd; that what was omitted was never judg'd essential. In short, that it is impossible to justify the Ordinations of any other Church whatsoever, if the form retain'd in the Church of *England* be reputed defective and invalid.

Behold here enough to dissipate the most just doubts. Nevertheless, it is said, that if in the alteration made, there was no room to doubt of the validity of the *English* Ordinations, How came it to pass that the catholic Bishops and Divines would never acknowledge these Bishops for true Bishops? And consequently, why has it been thought necessary to re-ordain such who have re-united themselves to the Church? If the invalidity of the Ordination was never sufficiently made out, could there be so much unanimity in rejecting it? And in so great a conformity

of judgments upon this Article, is it not at least strong enough to found a serious and solid doubt upon?

If a Man determine of the solidity of a doubt by the number of those that raise it, nothing certainly can be more reasonable, than the doubt now in question: But, as it is no further solid than it is founded upon good reasons, it is altogether a prejudice easily got over by an examination of the facts and proofs. In short, How many reasons are there by which we may form a tolerable judgment upon this Article? The little learning of the Divines of those times, the greatest part of whom, had but confus'd and undigested Ideas of what we call the matter and form of the Sacraments; the indignation which Queen *Mary* had conceiv'd against the Bishops, who had made such great alterations in the old Religion, the greatest part of them having strongly oppos'd her in her Brother's reign: The zeal of the Catholics, who, to render the persons and conduct of the reform'd Bishops more odious, were transported to be able to frame to themselves somewhat of nullity in their Ordinations: In fine, the inclination and fancy of several *English* Bishops for the discipline of *Geneva*, which contributed yet more to make it be believ'd, that their Ordination did not differ much from that of the Presbyterians: All these reasons united, contributed not a little to make the Catholics imagine, that the Ordinations perform'd according to *Edward* the *sixth's* Ordinal, were insufficient and invalid. And I should not have been in the least surpris'd, in times of contention as those were, in which all these changes were made, at their having been less favourable to the Ordinations of those, who in sundry respects, were very obnoxious to them.

But, notwithstanding all these prejudices, which have drawn the votes of the Bishops and Divines of those times after them, it ought not to be regarded as a doubt founded upon reason, forasmuch as the contrary,



contrary, in other respects, is supported upon something so solid.

In short, a Man ought never to judge of the validity of Ordinations by the ill-grounded doubts of Divines. When at *Rome* formerly, there were so many different opinions about the Ordinations of *Formosus* and *Constantine*, as shall be shewn in the following Chapter, could one believe that these different judgments, and the doubts arising from them, can justify the passionate conduct of the Popes who caus'd these Ordinations to be reiterated? Just so, when *Morinus* was at *Rome* in 1639, <sup>n</sup> he found a Congregation establish'd to examine into the validity of the *Greek* Ordinations. It was therefore doubted of at that time; and ought such a doubt to have been made against these Ordinations, whose validity could not be question'd by any reasonable Divine? Therefore it is not by a doubt that a Man ought to judge of the validity of Ordinations, but by the reasons upon which it is founded, and this doubt ought not to be made use of as an argument to support it self; for every doubt does not render a Sacrament invalid, therefore it ought to be of no weight here, forasmuch as there is no room to believe that the Ordinal was defective, or that the alteration made affected the substance. For it is plainly prov'd, that nothing essential was alter'd, and that in comparing this Ordinal with the antient forms that are publish'd, the differences will be found of very little importance, so that they cannot be urg'd as a reason proper to create a reasonable doubt, as to these Ordinations.

To support this suspicion, nothing remains then but to prove the uncertainty of *Barlow's* consecration, as the only reason that can, in any sense, authorize the Bishops and Divines in refusing to own the validity of the *English* Ordinations. For, it is said, that tho' it cannot be demonstrated, that he was not consecrated, yet this point remains dark enough for a Man to raise

<sup>n</sup> *Morinus de Sacr. Ordin. Præf.*

just suspicions, and to give the doubt all the necessary weight to make his Ordination uncertain and little probable, and consequently null and invalid.

But this second difficulty may be found effectually clear'd by what we have urg'd concerning *Barlow's* Ordination in the third, fourth and fifth Chapters; where there are so many proofs collected together of his Consecration, that a Man is forc'd to own that it cannot be prov'd he was never consecrated, and that he must confine himself for the present to a mere doubt. But it appears to me not difficult to prove, that there is not even room for the least reasonable doubt. For *First*, if there had been room to doubt of *Barlow's* consecration, it would have been objected to *Parker*, and brought as a strong proof against his own Ordination; nevertheless, among all the reproaches cast in his Teeth, and among all the arguments brought to invalidate his Consecration, it is not found that the defect of *Barlow's* Consecration was ever urg'd. Can any one imagine that a doubt thought of fifty years afterwards, could do any injury to an Ordination?

2. I freely own that it is most material here to be inform'd of the truth of the matter of fact, and that it is never too late to examine into the truth, especially when there are great interests attending it. But yet, what can be oppos'd to the proofs of *Barlow's* Consecration, strong enough to create a reasonable doubt? The loss of a Record supply'd by a great number of others: An omission of registering, whereof there is no advantage taken but against *Barlow* alone, tho' several omissions of the same kind are produc'd; which never caus'd the Consecration of those Bishops to be call'd in question, tho' there is no mention made of it in the Registers: A Record falsely transcrib'd by *Rymer*, which cannot be alledg'd against *Barlow*, even if it were found to be such, as that compiler represents it in his Collection: A chimerical threat, which never had any existence, and

Q

which

which if it were as true as it is imagin'd to be, can prove nothing against *Barlow's* Consecration ; because, as it may be seen in the fifth Chapter, if it were true that *Boner* did menace the Bishop of *Lan-daff* with excommunication, the case of *Barlow* was quite different ; the omission of that menace, with respect to him, cannot be urg'd in prejudice of his Consecration.

Therefore this doubt can only be founded upon bare presumptions and simple conjectures, and it is built only upon *Barlow's* inclination for the discipline of *Geneva*, and his errors in the Article of the Sacrament, and in particular in that of Ordination, which might give some room for suspicions ; also the loss of the Record of Consecration, or rather the omission of the registering might have occasion'd them. But, in truth, what appearance of reason is there to submit to probabilities and conjectures, which are contradicted by authentick Records, facts not controverted, and by testimonies anterior to *Parker's* Consecration, that is to say, at the only time when there was an interest to suppose it true.

For, in short, if *Barlow* was never truly consecrated, is it possible, that, during the space of almost four and twenty years, which pass'd between the time of his Ordination and that of *Parker's*, there should not be found one proper voucher to convince us of this truth ? That in the time when he might have freely discover'd himself, as was that of the reign of King *Edward*, one sees nothing to persuade him to the contrary but that he was a true Bishop ? That in the reign of Queen *Mary*, when he was forc'd to quit his Country, and seek for refuge among the Protestants, that he would not take off his Mask, and own that he was no more than a nominal Bishop, and that he had receiv'd no other Ordination but that of a mere Minister ? And in a word, that one finds neither by his conduct nor by his words ; neither by the testimonies of his Friends nor the re-  
proaches



proaches of his Enemies, any thing but what must persuade us that this Prelate was consecrated as much as all the rest; and that there is no just doubt to be rais'd against him, but what may be made against a vast number of other Bishops of that age, if once a door is open'd for conjectures to be put in competition with facts?

Yet, if these two particulars, that support with some sort of foundation the suspicion made use of against the validity of the *English* Ordinations, appear to have no force and no reason, what becomes of the doubt then, whereby the succession of the *English* Bishops is propos'd to be ruin'd? It being now the only argument that seems to bear upon them. For some time the Fable of the *Nagshhead* was insisted upon. This was the argument and the demonstration to which our Divines submitted, for want of an opportunity to satisfy themselves of the falshood and ridiculousness of that chimera. All the world have at present given it up, and we are even asham'd for our fore-fathers being so far credulous. It follows that the invalidity of the form be insisted upon; some Divines hold this a good objection: But it is not necessary to bring the matter to an hearing, among learned Men, in order to have this weak resource abandon'd. If one barely consult the antient Ordinals, the Canons of the Council of *Carthage*, and even our new Pontifical, and compare the *English* Ordinal with all these, let him afterwards determine if there be any thing wanting which antiquity thought to be essential to Ordination, and if any thing be retrench'd but what we look upon as bare Ceremonies, or added, to use the words of *Morinus*, but *only what tends to the solemnity of the Sacrament, and to an exemplification of its meaning*: I know very well what I do in referring my self to my readers upon this head.

After this they insisted very much on *Barlow*; but in short, this hold is hard to defend: For to make this good, it must necessarily follow, that all the laws

of the Kingdom were violated, that several Records were forg'd, that it pass'd in the Parliament as a Ceremony, which before and since his time, was look'd upon as essential; and which is more, that the thing had been both secret and publick at the same time, as it has been stated. All this is hard to digest; so that now this affair is reduc'd so low as to be founded upon a doubt. But I know not whether this will hold water long; for a Man can even no longer doubt either the falshood of the *Nagshhead* Fable, the validity of the Ordinal, or of *Barlow's* Consecration. This doubt is therefore a metaphysical entity, founded upon nothing, and which subsists only because there is a view and an interest in doubting. If from such doubts, the validity of Sacraments are deny'd, it is easy to make them invalid when one pleases.

But I shall add one thing more before I leave this article. *Champney* says, that to use an uncertain and less probable form in the matter of the Sacraments, is not only to commit a Sacrilege, but also to render the Sacrament null and invalid. This is also the opinion of most Divines, and which is the ground of the sentence of Pope *Innocent XI.* and of the Clergy of *France*, against a proposition which countenanc'd us in following the least sure, and least probable opinion in the administration of the Sacraments. This condemnation is very just, and I freely subscribe to this Doctrine.

But I am surpris'd to see this difficulty objected, which has almost no relation to our case. For in short, the Committee of Bishops appointed in King *Edward's* time to draw up a new Ordinal, when it was propos'd to make such changes as they should think necessary; these Prelates were persuaded that they did follow the most sure and most probable opinion: It being in short more sure and probable, that imposition of hands and prayer alone, made the essence of the Sacrament, than all the rest of the Ceremonies which were added by parcels and at different times.

times. This is what we have prov'd the greatest Divines of our times have own'd. They have no doubts upon this head. If our catholick Divines have doubted of it formerly, this was owing to the prejudice and ignorance of the age; and such a doubt does not influence the validity of the Ordination of those with whom it takes no place. To what purpose then serves it now to make use of a doubt, which the administrators of the Sacrament had not, and which others ought not to have had, and which is only criminal in those, who, notwithstanding such a doubt the bottom of which they are ignorant of, act against the testimony of their own Consciences, which reproves them, and which ought to hinder all their operations?

Therefore this is not the case here, where the doubt can hinder the acting, and where it renders all that is done invalid. But to destroy *Champney's* argument intirely, it is sufficient to oppose to his, one intirely contrary to it, whereof the evidence makes the proof. He says, ° that Ordination which is only probable, makes no more than a probable Bishop; and that a Bishop who is no more than probably a Bishop, is not a valid Bishop. To which I oppose this argument. An Ordination that is certain makes a Bishop that is certain, and one is truly a Bishop when he is such with certainty. Now the Ordination in question is certain; for an Ordination is such, when all that is essential is observ'd in it; that is to say imposition of Hands, Prayer, and the Consecrator. Now such is the *English* Ordination, as has been prov'd at large throughout this Treatise, and as it will appear convincing to all those who will be at the pains to examine into the facts.

But I say moreover, every doubt in this matter does not render the Sacrament invalid. The matter and form of Sacraments is a thing much disputed of in the Schools; there is no other point in which

° De vocat. Ministr. p. 224.



230 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

there has been a greater variety of opinions. Nevertheless, when somewhat is omitted which one party of Divines judge essential, the Sacrament does not become invalid for that reason, even when one party of Divines judge it so; since it is required that the doubt which they raise, should not only be real, but even solidly founded upon ecclesiastical Monuments proper to establish its credibility; without which such a doubt is not to be regarded. For example, it is known that 200 years ago, a great number of Divines thought the delivery of the Instruments necessary in Ordination. Notwithstanding this opinion, founded upon ignorance, who is there now that looks upon an Ordination invalid where this is omitted? And what learned Man will presume to declare for such an invalidity? The practice is, in truth, to supply what had been omitted, but this is only as the exorcisms after Baptism are supply'd, not as if they were necessary, but as a mark of obedience to the orders of the Church, and to render the spirit whereby she is animated more present to us, and the functions which she prescribes.

So that in what light soever we view this doubt, it is impossible to conclude from it the invalidity of the *English* Ordinations; and there can no other use be made of it, but to prove that there is nothing aim'd at by it, but to imbarraß the facts, and to make a thing obscure which of it self has no difficulties attending it; if a Man would reason by Principle, and inform himself without passion of all that may serve to the clearing up the truth.

I should have stopp'd here, if the Authors of the *Journal de Trevoux* had not given me an occasion to add somewhat to clear two difficulties, which they have propos'd upon this subject to the Author of the Apologetical Letter, for the succession of the Bishops in the Church of *England*. ¶ The first regards the dispute among the Divines, upon what is the essential

matter and form of Ordination. The second is taken from the defect of the Priesthood, which is suppos'd to be in the *English* Ministers. Let us examine both the one and the other. I am surpris'd that they appear solid to them, who give themselves out for the authors of them.

I have before touch'd upon the first in the beginning of this Chapter, so that it will not long detain me. It is <sup>9</sup> said, that the Divines are divided in their opinions as to what makes the essence of the matter and form of this Sacrament; that it may be probable, if you please, that imposition of Hands, and Prayer are the only essentials of Ordination; yet it must be acknowledg'd that the contrary opinion has also a great number of defenders; therefore it is true, that it is probable also, that imposition of Hands and Prayer are not all the essentials of an episcopal Ordination; it may therefore lawfully be believ'd that these Ordinations are invalid, and it will be always true that the *English* Bishops are not, or ought not to be reputed as sufficiently ordain'd, because it is probable that their Ordination is imperfect. To this argument, all the declamation of the Authors of the *Memoire* is reducible, who have done nothing more than to enlarge upon *Champney's* reasoning before mention'd, and which will not pass for a demonstration, but with these defenders of probability.

But, I am surpris'd, that these Divines, after having been so often foil'd about the pretended outward probability, would still insist upon a thing of this nature, where there is no question, but to be inform'd of the practice of the Church, and nothing at all of the metaphysical reasonings of Divines. If the question were to be decided by their authority, it would be in vain for us to cite any body, tho' the testimony of those which should be oppos'd to them would be a counterbalance to the authority of the former. But when I

<sup>9</sup> Ib. p. 723.

quote Father *Morin*, *Mabillon*, *F. Martin*, *Goar*, and such others, it is not to their testimony that I send the reader, it is to the authentick Monuments which they have publish'd, to the Rituals the most antient and venerable, to Pontificals the most unsuspected; to the *Roman* Ordinals; to the *Greek* Euchologies; to the testimonies of the Antients; and in a word, to all that can be credited concerning the practice of the Church upon this head. If it depended upon simple reasoning, one might oppose Author to Author, Father to Father, one Divine against another; and in such an opposition, where often they do not agree even upon their principles, one might look upon a question as barely probable when a superior authority, or an evident reason did not appear to decide it. But this is not our case, it is a matter of fact that is here treated of. The Monuments are in our own hands to decide it, and the question is determin'd by consulting the facts. Let *Durandus*, or *S. Anthony*, *Suarez* or *Vasquez*, *Isambert* or *Gamachius* think as they please, recourse must, in this case, be always had to what was done or what was omitted, and by this rule to conclude of the necessity, or the non-necessity of ecclesiastical Rites or Ceremonies; seeing a Man cannot regard as essential that which was neither practis'd universally, nor at all times, and that upon these Articles the rule of our Faith is form'd upon those of our usages.

Now, according to this Principle, which every judicious Divine must think incontestable, what becomes of the extrinsick probability of the Author of the difficulties? If this question ought not to be decided by the suffrage of Divines, but by the nature of the proofs, and by the authority of antient ecclesiastical Monuments, can one dispute a moment that prayer and imposition of Hands were not the only essential parts of Ordination? " It is owing to no-  
" thing but to reasoning upon the Sacraments with-



*of the English ORDINATIONS.* 233

“out any knowledge of the facts, says *M. l'Abbe Fleury*, that the Schoolmen have taken those for essential Ceremonies that are accessory only, as the Unction, and the delivering the Chalice to the Priest, instead of what in that Sacrament is essential, namely, the imposition of Hands.” Let us not dwell upon opinions founded only in ignorance of antient Tradition; but let us go even to the first sources to see if the contrary opinions have the least degree of probability. But how, in a time when the most part of the Ceremonies of the *Roman Pontifical* and of her formules were not in use, could one find these to prove the necessity of them? And, if they were not formerly thought necessary, why should they be so now? The pretended probability of the necessity of all these Ceremonies is therefore a chimera; and to found the invalidity of the *English Ordinations* upon such an opinion, is to make the validity of a Sacrament depend upon the opinions of some Divines, without their having any foundation in antiquity.

But, it is said, that the Scripture has not clearly and distinctly determin'd the matter and form of Ordinations: There is nothing in the Fathers and Councils that can give a sure foundation to the opinion of the sufficiency of the imposition of Hands; and when there is not in the Church any decision in favour of this opinion, the catholick Church is to the *English* an incompetent Tribunal, whose judgment they reject, and consequently, they cannot draw any advantage, in their favour, from her; so that all is confin'd to the judgment of Divines, who are found to be divided, which can amount to no more than a probable opinion; whereas a probability does not destroy a contrary probability, and by consequence cannot sufficiently assure the validity of Ordination.

Nothing is more false than what is here advanc'd; that there is nothing either in Scripture, or in Tradition, which can ascertain the sufficiency of imposition of Hands and of Prayer in Ordination. I will

will agree, that the Scripture does not clearly and distinctly determine the matter and form of Ordinations; but yet, it declares imposition of Hands and Prayer, and nothing else: This declaration is supported by the testimony of Fathers and Councils; and that which is peremptory, is, that the practice of the Church represented in the antient Pontificals, and other ecclesiastical Books, is found to be conformable to these testimonies, not leaving any the least probability of the necessity of any thing else. The judgment of the catholick Church is not so incompetent a Tribunal as is suppos'd. It is not therefore the cause of the *English* that is treated of here, it is that of the whole Church; and if the *English* were only concern'd, who reject her infallibility, in a matter of this nature, the practice of the antient Church only, forms a proof, to which they always profess a willingness to conform. Now to reduce this answer into a few words, it is certain, that the Scripture insinuates the sufficiency of the imposition of Hands and of Prayer, and insinuates nothing else; that the Fathers and Councils without dispute insist upon it, and the practice of the Church demonstrates it. Now a practice thus establish'd and demonstrated, leaves no manner of probability to a contrary practice. The opinion of the Divines, who favour the necessity of the other Ceremonies, is neither true nor probable; and the other alone is probable, and consequently is perfectly sure in the practice.

Who told you, say they, that those who do not think as you do are in an error? But should that be ask'd when there are at hand proofs so strong and numerous? Who told it me, say you? It is the Scripture, which I understand by the silence which it observes with respect to so many of the modern Ceremonies; it is the Fathers and Councils who did not so much as know the practices which you insist upon as necessary; it is the *Greek Church* which is ignorant of them to this time, and professes to be ignorant

rant of them ; it is our own Churches who receiv'd not the greatest part of them until these later ages, and which the Rituals and antient Pontificals make no mention of. Ought a Man to hesitate, having such authorities on his side, in rejecting an hazardous opinion of some Schoolmen, who judg'd of the first ages by their own times, who were rash enough to determine upon the matter and forms of the Sacraments, by metaphysical rules, without having any just idea of these matters, without any knowledge of the antient Discipline ?

And besides, as I have before observ'd, if once you make the certainty or the validity of Sacraments depend upon the doubts or opinions of Divines, when shall we be at a certainty in things of this nature ? Some are divided about the form of a Sacrament, others about the matter, and some few even about the administrator of them. This will have a deprecatory form, the other will have an imperative one ; some will admit for the matter one thing, and some another ; there is no end of these doubts, if one is ty'd up to their sentiments as to a Rule. But these sort of opinions never serv'd to decide the validity of a Sacrament. The usage and practice of each Church in these undetermin'd points is the main rule. It is by this we justify the *Greeks* ; it is by this rule we receive the Sacraments of the *Orientalists* ; it being lawful for you to supply all the Ceremonies which Religion, or Solemnity inspires you to add : But the omission of them does not in the least derogate from the validity of the Sacraments conferr'd without them ; and it is certain, that the opinions of Divines cannot make these Ceremonies necessary, whose no-necessity is demonstrated by the contrary practice of Churches and the omission of them for several ages.

I proceed to the second difficulty, which is not more solid, but yet it is singular enough to deserve to be related in the very words of the author, for  
fear



## 236 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

fear that I should seem to weaken it. " Let us add, says  
 " he<sup>f</sup> that the episcopal Ordination necessarily suppo-  
 " ses a sacerdotal Ordination as a disposition essen-  
 " tial, and necessary according to the catholick O-  
 " pinion. Now you have not among you *English*  
 " the foundation of sacerdotal Ordination; for in the  
 " opinion of the Church, the Priesthood of the new  
 " Covenant principally and essentially includes the  
 " power to consecrate and sacrifice the adorable Bo-  
 " dy and Blood of *Jesus Christ*; a power which passes  
 " among you for chimerical as the Sacrifice it self; a  
 " power which you reject, and which your Ordina-  
 " tions give not; consequently the Catholics are in  
 " the right to dispute with your Prelates the title of  
 " Bishops, as long as they are persuaded, that there  
 " is not among you so much as true Priests."

I do not know whether the Author of the difficul-  
 ties pretends to propose to us here somewhat that is  
 new; but the truth is, that *Champney* formerly insisted  
 upon it, and that *Mason* then answer'd him in an intire  
 Book: " ' Whence it necessarily follows, says *Champ-*  
 " *ney*, that those pretended Bishops neither are, nor  
 " were true Bishops, forasmuch as they were not  
 " true Priests; that is to say, they had not a power  
 " to offer the true Sacrifice; and therefore have such,  
 " and so essential a defect in the episcopal calling,  
 " which all their predecessors labour'd under, that al-  
 " tho' at first they had been true Bishops, yet they  
 " cannot be such now." This is exactly the objecti-  
 on of the Author of the difficulties; which, as a bo-  
 dy may see, has nothing in it that deserves a new an-  
 swer. But be this difficulty antient or modern, this

<sup>f</sup> Journal de Trevoux, Avril 1722. p. 729.    <sup>t</sup> Unde neces-  
 sariò sequitur, prætenso illos Episcopos—non esse neque fuisse  
 veros Episcopos, quandoquidem veri sacerdotes non fuerint; hoc  
 est, verum sacrificium offerendi potestatem non habuerint: Ac  
 proinde talem tamque essentialem Episcopalis vocationis defe-  
 ctum super omnes prædecessores suos habere, ut etiam si illi veri  
 Episcopi fuissent, isti tamen tales esse non possint. De Vocat.  
 Min. c. 16. p. 740.

is not the question; the point is to know if it be solid, and this is what must be examin'd.

The manner in which the Author proposes the difficulty, does not necessarily imply that it should be believ'd. This is a subsidiary way of reasoning, that appears abroad not so much to fortify the cause, as with a design to embarrass an adversary by the delicateness of the matter upon which he must be oblig'd to explain himself; and it is difficult to treat a subject to the taste of some certain Divines. As to the rest, he has reason not to lay any great stress upon such an argument. All the propositions in it are false or very uncertain; and I am surpris'd that a Man should deliver such writings to the publick with an air of complaisance, as if there had been somewhat very singular in them to be known.

For it is false, that the episcopal Ordination supposes the sacerdotal, and it is a rashness yet more unpardonable than ignorance itself, to make a *Catholic Dogma* out of a falshood. It is false, that the sacerdotal power is conferr'd by the words that declare the power of sacrificing. It is false, that the *English* do not acknowledge the sacrifice in the sense of our best Divines, that is to say, a *representative and commemorative Sacrifice*, as the Bishops of *Belley* and *Meaux*, Father *Veron*, the Author of the *Moral Divinity* of St. *Augustine*, and a number of others call it, who are the best study'd upon this point. It is false, that in this sense, the *English* do not acknowledge in their Priests a power of sacrificing, and that their Ordination does not confer this power. In a word, this argument is no more than a collection of false suppositions and sophisms, which do not deserve that a Man should dwell long to refute them, intended only to embarrass the principal question by such foreign digressions.

I say first, that it is false, that episcopal Ordination supposes that the sacerdotal was conferr'd before; since, according to *Bellarmino* himself, the one and the other may be conferr'd by the same Consecration.

u *Impossibile*

ⁱ *Impossibile est ordinari Episcopum, qui antea non sit Presbyter, vel certe non tunc simul accipiat utramque Ordinationem; quia utraque est de essentia Episcopatus.* And, according to St. Jerom \* the Priest is included in the Bishop: *In Episcopo & Presbyter continetur.* And in short, it appears by several examples of antiquity, by the antient Roman Ordinals, by the reproaches of the Greeks, by the acknowledgment of the Latins, and even by the complaints of some Popes, that the Episcopat was sometimes conferr'd without the Priesthood preceding it; and even those, who look'd upon these Ordinations as unlawful, appear not to have doubted of their validity. † *Nonnulli ex quacunque militia se ad Ecclesiam conferentes,* says Pope Zozimus, *statim saltu quodam summam locum Religionis affectant, qui gradatim per ecclesiastica Stipendia venientes, explorata solet discussione differri: idcirco quoniam in nonnullis factum infirmare non possumus, si qui jam ordinati sunt, in eo gradu ad quem saltu subito pervenerunt perdurare debebunt.* The examples of the Popes Sabinian, Constantine, Valentine, Nicolas the first, and some others, leave us even no room to doubt, that this which Zozimus look'd upon as unlawful, often happen'd at Rome; and after such examples, I leave the truth and solidity of this proposition to be judg'd of, that episcopal Ordination necessarily supposes sacerdotal Ordination.

But that which cannot be pass'd over without censure is, the making a *Catholick Dogma* of a very false opinion, or at least a very uncertain one, which the Schools are divided about, which the most learned Divines have attack'd in the face of the Church, and which is contradicted by examples, and by the strongest theological Reasons, as it were easy to prove, if a Man were not afraid to be carry'd into digressions not essential to the purpose.

But suppose that true which is false, that the episcopal Ordination supposes the sacerdotal, the Author of the *Memoire* will gain no ground. For how does

ⁱ De Ordin. c. 5. \* Ep. 85. † Zozim. Ep. ad Patrocl. Arelat.



it prove the nullity of the *English* Priesthood? "It is, says he, <sup>z</sup> because the *English* Ordination gives no power to sacrifice." But where is it understood, that the Priesthood is conferr'd by the form that gives a power to sacrifice? There is not a word of it in the antient Ordinals, no more than in the *Euchologies* and *Rituals* of the *Greeks*, the *Syrians*, the *Coptics*, and generally speaking of all the *Orientalists*. One may consult upon this subject the Collection of *F. Martin*, <sup>a</sup> and there he will see that it was about the eleventh *Century* that this form was introduc'd. <sup>b</sup> *Receive power to offer Sacrifice to God, to celebrate Mass as well for the living as the dead, in the Name of the Lord.* A form which was not brought in, but with the ceremony of the Chalice and the Paten; independently of which, the Priests were before most validly consecrated in the *Latin Church*, and are yet so in all the eastern Churches. So that *Morinus* and *F. Martin* scruple not to reject the opinion of those who would make this form to be look'd upon as the form of the Ordination of Priests, being so modern as it is, and receiv'd only in the *Latin Church*.

The omission of this form in the *English* Ordinal, therefore cannot prejudice the *English* Priesthood; the rather, because they make no difficulty to own the Sacrifice in the same sense with most of the antient Fathers, and of our most judicious controversial writers; that is to say, a *representative and commemorative Sacrifice*, which is not different from that of the Cross, and which bears the Name, because it is the image and memorial of it, and because the same victim is offer'd. This is what is expressly acknowledg'd, among other learned *English* Divines, by *William* and *John Forbes*, *Mason*, *Bishop Andrews*, *Thorndike*, *Jos. Mead* who writ a *Treatise* purposely upon this subject, *Grabe* in his *Notes* upon *St. Irenaus*,

<sup>z</sup> Journal, &c. 729.

<sup>a</sup> De Ant. Rit. Tom. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, missamque celebrare tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis in nomine Domini.

and

and a multitude of others. And I even dare affirm, that those among them who seem to have appear'd against this Doctrine, quarrel'd with nothing but the opinion of those of our Divines, who sustain, that in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, there is a real immolation made; and that it is not the memory of the death of *Jesus Christ*, but the death itself which is renew'd; an opinion which is not founded but upon unexact and unauthoriz'd Notions.

We have nothing to say, says the Bishop of Ely, against the term Sacrifice and Oblation. <sup>c</sup> *Nec a voce sacrificii vel oblationis abhorremus.* We offer, says *John Forbes*, the Sacrifice of *Jesus Christ*, not in the sense of a new Sacrifice, but in making memorial of his Sacrifice, and in praying to God to make it propitiatory to us. <sup>d</sup> *Ipsam ejus (Christi) obedientiam cruentamque immolationem offerimus Deo, non sacrificando Christum, aut de novo immolando, sed unicam illam, pro nobis in passione semel factam, Christi immolationem commemorando; Deum suppliciter orantes, ut eam intuens nobis peccatoribus sit propitius; non propter hanc nostram commemorationem, sed propter cruentam illam verè & propriè sacrificatoriam & propitiatoriam oblationem, quam commemoramus Deoque offerimus non oblatione sacrificatoriâ, sed commemorativâ, &c.* *Mason*, *Mead*, and several others, whom I might name, express themselves in the same manner. But not to enlarge here to no purpose, I will content my self with the testimony of *Doctor Grabe*. It is certain says this Author, <sup>e</sup> that *St. Irenæus*, and all the Fathers, as well those who had seen the Apostles, as they who succeeded them, look'd upon the Eucharist as the sacrifice of the new Law, and that they offer'd the Bread and Wine as an Holy Offering; these they offer'd him before the Consecration, as the first fruits of his Creatures, to acknowledge his sovereign Dominion over all things; and after their Consecration, they look'd

<sup>c</sup> *Apol. cont. Bellarm. c. 8. Theol. l. xi. c. 20. §. 25.*

<sup>d</sup> *Joan. Forb. Instit. Hist. Not. in Iren. lib. 4. cap. 32.*

upon them as the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ*, in order to represent the bloody Sacrifice offer'd upon the Cross, and to obtain the fruits of his death for all them for whom it is offer'd. This is not, says he, the Doctrine of one Church, or of one particular Doctor, but of the universal Church; the Church having receiv'd it from the Apostles, and the Apostles from *Jesus Christ*. *Atque hanc non privatam particularis Ecclesiæ vel Doctoris, sed publicam universalis Ecclesiæ doctrinam atque praxim fuisse, quam illa ab Apostolis, Apostoli ab ipso Christo acceperunt; disertèque hoc Irenæus atque ante ipsum Justinus, & Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Tertullianus, Cyprianus, & alii.* Such is the language and doctrine of the *English Divines*, which implies an authentick acknowledgment of the sacrifice of *Jesus Christ*, renew'd and represented in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries; and nothing is more conformable to the language and doctrine of the Fathers, of our antient Divines, and of our best controversial Writers.

St. *Chrysostom*, in his Homilies upon the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, expresses himself after the same manner. *Quid vero, says he, nos non quotidie offerimus? Offerimus quidem, sed ejus mortem revocamus in memoriam, & ipsa una est, & non multæ—Pontifex noster ille est, qui illam obrulit hostiam, quæ nos mundat. Illam nunc quoque offerimus quæ tunc fuit oblata, quæ non potest consumi. Hoc fit in recordationem ejus quod tunc factum est. Hoc enim facite, inquit, in mei recordationem. Non aliam hostiam sicut Pontifex, sed eandem semper facimus, vel potius hostiæ seu Sacrificii facimus recordationem.* Μαλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.

*Eusebius of Casarea* expresses himself yet in much stronger terms, in order to signify, that the Sacrifice which we offer is no other than a representative and commemorative Sacrifice. *Itaque post omnia, says he, quasi mirabilem quandam victimam Sacrificiumque*

<sup>f</sup> Homil. 17. in Ep. ad Heb. c. 10.

<sup>g</sup> Demonstr. Evang. lib. 1.



*eximium Patri suo operatus pro nostra omnium salute obtulit ; ejusque rei memoriam ut nos ipsi Deo pro Sacrificio offerremus instituit : μνήμην καὶ ἡμῖν παρεδῆς ἀντὶ θυσίας τοῦ θεοῦ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν — Igitur & sacrificamus & incendimus memoriam magni illius Sacrificii secundum ea quæ ab ipso tradita sunt mysteria celebrantes. θύωμεν καὶ θυμίσωμεν — τὴν μνήμην τῆς μεγάλης θύματος.*

St. *Augustin* expresses himself in no other manner, since he gives us to understand, that *Jesus Christ* left us the resemblance of his sacrifice to celebrate. <sup>h</sup> *Christus ipse est sacerdos noster in æternum secundum Ordinem Melchisedech, qui seipsum obtulit holocaustum pro peccatis nostris, & ejus Sacrificii similitudinem, celebrandam in suæ Passionis memoriam, commendavit, ut illud quod Melchisedech obtulit Deo, jam per totum orbem terrarum in Christi Ecclesia videamus offerri.* But the expression which he makes use of in his Books against *Faustus* is yet more remarkable, since that he calls our sacrifice the Sacrament of commemoration. <sup>i</sup> *Hujus sacrificii caro & sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur, in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur ; post ascensum Christi per Sacramentum memoriæ celebratur.*

It is thus the greatest part of the antient Fathers express themselves ; and it would not be difficult for us to increase the number of their testimonies, if this were the place to enlarge upon this subject. St. *Ignatius*, *Tertullian*, St. *Cyprian*, and several others, acknowledge not the sacrifice in the celebration of our Mysteries in any other sense ; that which St. *Ambrose* is made <sup>k</sup> to say, is, that *Jesus Christ* offers himself for us in truth in Heaven to his Father, but that upon our Altars he is only offer'd representatively : *Hic in imagine, ibi in veritate.*

Our antient Divines have observ'd the same Notions : For, not to heap together a number of superfluous authorities, the master of the Sentences, and St.

<sup>h</sup> Lib. Quæst. qu. 62.

<sup>i</sup> Lib. 20. con. Faust. cap. 23.

<sup>k</sup> Lib. 1. de offic. c. 48.

Thomas, are alone sufficient to convince us of this.

<sup>1</sup> *Dici potest*, says the former, *illud quod offertur & consecratur à sacerdote, vocari sacrificium & oblationem; quia memoria est & repræsentatio veri sacrificii, & sanctæ immolationis factæ in ara crucis. At semel Christus mortuus in cruce est, ibique immolatus est in seipso; quotidie autem immolatur in Sacramento, quia in Sacramento recordatio fit illius, quod factum est semel.* St. Thomas explains himself in a manner yet much stronger. <sup>m</sup> *Respondeo dicendum*, says he, *quod duplici ratione celebratio hujus Sacramenti dicitur immolatio Christi. Primo quidem, quia, sicut dicit Augustinus ad Simplicium, solent imagines earum rerum nominibus appellari, quarum imagines sunt — Celebratio autem hujus Sacramenti imago quædam est repræsentativa Passionis Christi, quæ est vera ejus immolatio: & ideo celebratio hujus sacramenti dicitur Christi immolatio.* Hugo de Sancto Victore, Nicolas Lyra, and most of the antient Schoolmen thought no otherwise upon this subject. It is ill done, in the room of these Opinions so simple, so natural, for a Man to substitute explications proper only to create new difficulties, and to embarrass a subject, which has only been successful in increasing divisions.

Thus our best controversial writers have taken no other way to explain this difficulty, and they found nothing in the Eucharist, but a *representative and a commemorative sacrifice*. Cardinal Gropper, Cassander, Barnes, Ferus, of the first rank: The Bishops of Belley and Meaux, as well as Father Veron, and some others among those that follow'd them, neither teach nor require the belief of any thing else. *Such is*, saith the late M. Bossuet in his Exposition of the Faith, <sup>n</sup> *the sacrifice of Christians, infinitely different from those practis'd under the Law: A spiritual sacrifice worthy of the new Covenant, where the victim offer'd is not perceiv'd but by Faith; where the sword is the word that mystically separates the Body and the Blood; where consequently the*

<sup>1</sup> Lib. 4. Sentent. dist. 12.  
<sup>n</sup> P. 132.

<sup>m</sup> Pt. 3. qu. 83. art. 1.

*Blood is not spilt but mysteriously, and where death does not happen but in representation—the sacrifice of Commemoration, &c.* One may see the same thing in his Catechism, ° where it is observ'd, that in this sacrifice *Jesus Christ* is offer'd no otherwise than *mystically*; and that this sacrifice is *the commemoration of that upon the Cross.*

The Bishop of *Belley* <sup>p</sup> has thus explain'd this before him, that the sacrifice of the faithful is a sacrifice *unbloody, representative and commemorative.* Father *Veron* <sup>q</sup> does not require that a Man should believe more; and in his *general rule of Faith* he distinctly observes, following *Vasquez*, that it is sufficient to believe that it is a sacrifice, *relative and commemorative.* These last testimonies ought not to be suspected by the Author of the difficulties, and I believe that he will not refuse them.

I am not insensible in other respects, that the sacrifice of the Altar is call'd a *real sacrifice.* But these are questions concerning words which Divines are divided about, and which cannot authorize a division in the Faith. So to take off all blame from the *English*, it suffices that they own with the Fathers, and our best Divines, the sacrifice of *Jesus Christ* renew'd and represented in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries; and one may see by the testimonies before related, that they acknowledge it in this sense. Now, seeing it is sufficient to own it in this sense, the supposition of the Author is therefore false in this respect.

But moreover, since the *English* acknowledge the sacrifice in a sense which our best Divines judge sufficient; it is therefore very false, that they do not own a power in their Priests to offer such a sacrifice, and that their Ordination does not confer it: For this power is included in that which is given them to administer the Sacraments, and to perform all the functions annex'd to the Priesthood of *Jesus Christ.* Now

° Cathech. p. 234.  
Gen. p. 78.

<sup>p</sup> Avois. des Prot. 214.

<sup>q</sup> Reg.



*of the* English ORDINATIONS. 245

the celebration of the Eucharist has ever been look'd upon as one of the principal functions of the Priesthood; and it is certain, that before the bringing in the ceremony of delivering the Chalice, and the Paten into the Ordination of Priests, one does not find that the power of offering sacrifice was particularly confer'd upon a new ordain'd Priest, and that it is not at this day observ'd in the greatest part of the oriental Churches. However, they are not the worse Priests, and consequently the omission of a form of the like kind, where an explicit designation to that function is contain'd, ought not to annihilate the Priesthood among the *English*, who use imposition of Hands and Prayer to ask the Grace, necessary to accomplish the duties of the Priesthood, *to the office and work of a Presbyter*. This is what comprehends in general all the functions of the Priesthood.

Besides, it is certain, that according to King *Edward's* Ordinal, the celebration of the holy Mysteries is look'd upon as an essential function of the Priesthood. All the Rubricks of the Ordinal confirm it; and it does not appear that this part of the sacerdotal Office was given up to inferiour Ministers. Therefore they acknowledg'd this power in the Priests, and this they believe conferr'd by their Ordination.

It is also certain, that *Parker* was ordain'd a Priest according to the *Roman* Pontifical, before his Episcopal consecration; he therefore receiv'd a power to offer sacrifice. The Episcopate therefore was not confer'd upon him to no purpose; and, if he was validly ordain'd, the principal part of the question is terminated, since almost all agree the Ordination of the other Bishops depends upon that of *Parker*.

But be it how it will as to this Ordination, it is sufficient to ascertain the Priesthood of the *English*, that the matter and form of the sacerdotal Ordination which they use, can be look'd upon as including all that was ever reputed essential in that Ordination, and that in conferring it, they exclude not any of the

246 *A* DEFENCE of the *Validity*

Powers which have ever been annex'd to the Priesthood by *Jesus Christ*. This is what will appear certain to all those who will examine the thing without prejudice.

---

C H A P. XIII.

*An answer to the sixth difficulty. The Re-ordinations of some English Bishops proves not that there was any thing essential wanting in their first Ordination.*

ONE of the reasons which *M. l'Abbe Renaudot* brings against the validity of the *English* Ordinations, is, says he, that in the reign of *Queen Mary*, the Catholick Bishops, and the most able Divines, order'd that the Bishops and Priests ordain'd according to *Edward the sixth's* Liturgy should be re-ordain'd, and that they did not degrade those condemn'd to death, because that they were look'd upon as Laymen. It was the same under *Queen Elizabeth*. The Catholicks would never own them for true Bishops who receiv'd their Ordination from *Parker*, and people have been since divided about the validity of the *English* Ordinations, when ever the subject was brought into play; that every *English* Minister who re-unites himself to the Catholick Church, if he be thought worthy to be admitted into the Clergy, all the Orders are conferr'd upon him as a mere Laick, all the same as it was lately practis'd at *Rome*.

I shall not here dispute the truth of these facts with *M. l'Abbe Renaudot*. It is certain, that in the time of *Queen Mary* the Bishops, whom she caus'd to be condemn'd to death upon the account of Heresy, were not degraded from the Orders which they had receiv'd by *Edward's* Ordinal; this is an evident and a publick fact. It is also certain, that in *Queen Elizabeth's*

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 247

beth's reign, the *English* Catholicks refus'd to own *Parker* for a Bishop, as well as those whom he consecrated. *Sanders*, *Stapleton*, *Harding*, and those who have written against the *English*, give sufficient proofs of this; and it is in consequence of their conduct, and their decisions, that *Rome* now follows this practice. But the question here is not to know what was done, but that which ought to have been done; and it does not appear that the facts and the motives, whereby this is determin'd, ought to serve to determine us too.

For in the first place, the conduct observ'd in Queen *Mary's* reign, in the degradations, were not very uniform. If they had acted by principle, it seems that they ought to have contented themselves with not degrading them ordain'd by *Edward's* new form. For it is now agreed, that, those who were ordain'd in *Henry the eighth's* time, or even in King *Edward's*, before the change made in the form of Ordination, were true Bishops; and yet, several of these Prelates were not degraded from their episcopal Function before they were put to death. We find among others, *Latimer* Bishop of *Worcester*, *Ridley* Bishop of *Rocheſter*, and *Farrar* Bishop of *St. Davids*. The first of these was consecrated in 1535, under *Henry the eighth*, and the other two under *Edward* in 1547, and in 1548, before there was any change made in the form of Ordination. Nevertheless, none of them were degraded according to the testimony of the *English* writers. " About a fortnight forward, says " *Collier*, another commission was issued from the " Cardinal Legat to *White* Bishop of *Lincoln*, *Brooks* " Bishop of *Gloceſter*, and *Holyman* Bishop of *Bristol*, " or any two of them, to proceed to the de- " grading Bishop *Ridley* and Bishop *Latimer*, pro- " vided they could not prevail with them to re- " cant. These commissioners finding them firm to " their former persuasion, and refusing to own any

<sup>r</sup> *Collier's Ecclesiast. Hist. Tom. 2. p. 385.*



“ authority from the Cardinal *Legat*, pronounc’d them  
 “ guilty of Heresy ; and then declaring they were no  
 “ longer Members of the Church, consign’d them o-  
 “ ver to the secular Magistrate, to be punish’d as the  
 “ Law directs. They were only degraded from  
 “ Priests Orders. This was somewhat particular,  
 “ since Cardinal *Pool* in his commission styles them  
 “ Bishops ; and in case of obstinacy, directs their  
 “ degradation from that character. And further,  
 “ *White* Bishop of *Lincoln*, one of the commissioners,  
 “ owns *Ridley* was made a Bishop according to the  
 “ Laws of the Church of *Rome*. But *Brooks* Bi-  
 “ shop of *Glocester*, who seems to have been the most  
 “ bigotted Delegate, would allow neither of them  
 “ to be any more than Priests.”

It was the same as to *Farrar*, by the testimony of  
 the same Author. “ <sup>f</sup> *Farrar* Bishop of *St. Davids*,  
 “ says he, was sent out of the world the same way.  
 “ He was carried from *London* to *Caermarthen*, to  
 “ stand the process : He was brought before his suc-  
 “ cessor *Morgan*, who pronounc’d him an Heretick  
 “ for marrying after his being profess’d a Religious :  
 “ For maintaining Justification by Faith only : For de-  
 “ nyng Transubstantiation, and the propitiatory sa-  
 “ crifice of the Mass. In the sentence he is styled a  
 “ Priest, and degraded no further. Bishop *Farrar*  
 “ appeal’d from *Morgan* to Cardinal *Pool*, but that  
 “ application was rejected.”

This conduct plainly proves, that in this affair  
 they did not act much by Principles. In short, as  
*Burnet* observes, they were not uniform in what  
 they did upon this head. “ One thing is remark-  
 “ able, that it appears, both by these [Articles] and  
 “ the Queen’s Injunctions, that they did not pretend  
 “ to re-ordain those that had been ordain’d by the  
 “ new Book in King *Edward*’s time ; but to recon-  
 “ cile them, and add those things that were want-

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. p. 380.

<sup>t</sup> Burnet’s *Hist. Reform.* Tom. 2. p. 289,

ing ; which were the anointing, and giving the priestly Vestments, with other rites of the *Roman Pontifical*.— But now, though they only supplied at this time the defects, which they said were in their former Ordinations, yet afterwards, when they proceeded to burn them that were in Orders, they went upon the old Maxim : That Orders given in Schism were not valid ; so that they did not esteem *Hooper* nor *Ridley* Bishops, and therefore only degraded them from the Priesthood, tho' they had been ordain'd \* by their own forms, saving only the Oath to the Pope ; but for those who were ordain'd by the new Book, they did not at all degrade them, supposing now that they had no true Orders by it."

A proof that they varied upon this matter, and that at first they did not think to re-ordain them who had been ordain'd even by the new Ordinal, as *Burnet* justly observes, may be collected from some Records in his collection of Pieces which are annex'd to his History. Scarcely had *Queen Mary* found herself fix'd upon the Throne, when she sent an order to the Bishops to make, as soon as possible, a visitation of their Dioceses, following the instructions which she had sent them. In the fifteenth " Article of these instructions, where the Ordination of Ministers is mention'd, there is nothing spoken of re-ordaining, but to supply what they wanted. Here is the Article as it is publish'd. " Touching such persons as were heretofore promoted to any Orders, after the new sort and fashion of Orders, considering they were not ordered in very deed, the Bishop of the Diocese, finding otherwise sufficiency and ability in those Men, may supply that thing which wanted in them before ; and then,

\* *Burnet* mistakes as to *Hooper*, who was ordain'd by the Ordinal of King Edward. *Cranmer's Memorial*, p. 254. " *Burnet's Collection of Records*, Tom. 2. p. 255.

" according

"according to his discretion, admit them to minister."

Some pretend that by these words, *he may supply that thing which wanted in them before*; it is not only meant to supply the Ceremonies omitted in *Edward's Ordinal*, but to supply the Orders which they receiv'd according to that ceremonial; and the conduct which they observ'd as to the degradation of those who had been ordain'd under King *Edward*, according to them, seems to prove it. But this is the question: And seeing their conduct towards those ordain'd under *Henry the eighth*, was the same as that to those under King *Edward*, is it not more natural to believe, that it was not until afterwards that these Ordinations were look'd upon as invalid? That which makes this credible is, that the word *supply* is never us'd for conferring Orders, but barely relates to Ceremonies. This may yet further be confirm'd by the twenty ninth Article of the interrogatories for his visitation prescrib'd by *Boner*, and printed in the same Collection. \* "Whether any such as were ordered schismatically, and contrary to the old order and custom of the Catholick Church, or being unlawfully and schismatically married, after the late innovation and manner, being not yet reconciled, or admitted by the Ordinary, have celebrated or said, either Mass or Divine Service, within any Cure or Place of this City or Diocess?" It is certain, that here those are included who were ordain'd in King *Edward's* time, seeing they are mention'd in these terms, *ordered contrary to the Custom of the Catholick Church*: Nevertheless it is not order'd, but that the same sort of reconciliation should serve as well for them who had been either ordain'd during the Schism, or that had married unlawfully after their Ordination. Therefore, there was nothing at first acted like re-ordination, and those under King *Edward* were look'd upon as validly ordain'd.

\* Ibid. p. 264.



## of the English ORDINATIONS. 251

The plenary power given by *Julius III.* to his Legate Cardinal *Pole*, to reconcile *England* to the Church of *Rome*, and printed at the end of the translation of \* *Burnet's History*, is yet more positive and clear. For, speaking of the Bishops ordain'd in the time of King *Edward*, there is nothing of re-ordination mention'd, but barely to reconcile them to the Church, and to re-instate them. The passage, tho' it be a little long, yet it is too important to be omitted.

*Necnon de personis quorumcumque Episcoporum vel Archiepiscoporum, qui Metropolitanam aut alias Cathedrales Ecclesias de manu Laicorum, etiam Schismaticorum, & præsertim qui de Henrici Regis & Edwardi ejus nati receperunt, & earum regimini & administrationi se ingesserunt, & earum fructus, redditus & proventus etiam longissimo tempore, tanquam veri Archiepiscopi aut Episcopi, temerè & de facto usurpando, etiamsi in hæresim, ut præfertur, inciderint, seu antea hæretici fuerint; postquam per te unitati S. Matris Ecclesiæ restituti extiterint, tuque eos rehabilitandos esse censueris, si tibi aliàs digni & idonei videbuntur, ejusdem Metropolitanis Ecclesiis per obitum vel privationem illorum præsulum, seu aliàs quovis modo pro tempore vacantibus, de personis idoneis pro quibus ipsa Maria Regina juxta consuetudines ipsius Regni tibi supplicaverit autoritate nostra providere, ipsasque personas eisdem Ecclesiis in Episcopos aut Archiepiscopos præficere: ac cum aliis qui Ecclesias Cathedrales & Metropolitanas de manu laicorum etiam Schismaticorum, ut præfertur, receperunt, quod eisdem seu aliis ad quas eas alias ritè transferre contigerit, Cathedralibus etiam & Metropolitanis Ecclesiis in Episcopos vel Archiepiscopos præesse, ipsasque Ecclesias in spiritualibus & temporalibus regere & gubernare, ac munere consecrationis eis hætenus impenso uti, vel si illud eis impensum extiterit, ab Episcopis vel Archiepiscopis Catholicis per te nominandis suscipere liberè & licitè possint.*

\* This piece is to be found intire among my proofs. y Tom.  
part 2. p. 1075. of the Amsterdam Edition in 12<sup>o</sup> Anno  
1687.

This passage is better adapted than any other, to prove that the *English* Ordinations were not always so ill thought of as M. l'Abbe Renaudot makes them to have been. For, *First*, it is certain, that King Edward's Bishops are mention'd here as well as Henry the eighth. *Et præsertim qui de [manu] Henrici Regis & Edwardi ejus natæ Ecclesias receperunt, & earum regimini & administrationi se ingesserunt.* *Secondly*, That there is no distinction made between the Ordinations perform'd according to the *Roman Pontifical*, and those by Edward's Ritual. *Thirdly*, The Legate is permitted to reestablish all them that were consecrated, without consecrating them again. *Postquam per te unitati Sanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ restituti extiterint, tuque eos rehabilitandos esse censueris, si tibi aliàs digni & idonei videbuntur—Cathedralibus, etiam Metropolitanis Ecclesiis in Episcopos vel Archiepiscopos præesse, ipsasque ecclesias in spiritualibus & temporalibus regere & gubernare, ac munere consecrationis eis hæcenus impenso uti—libere & licitè possint.* *Fourthly*, But even to prevent all difficulties that may be made, the Bull takes notice of the case of a sacerdotal Ordination, perform'd contrary to Law, and gives the Legate power to dispense with it. *Nec non cum quibusvis per te, ut præmittitur, pro tempore absolutis & rehabilitatis, ut, eorum erroribus & excessibus præteritis non obstantibus, quibusvis Cathedralibus, etiam Metropolitanis Ecclesiis in Episcopos & Archiepiscopos præfici & præesse, illasque in eisdem spiritualibus & temporalibus regere & gubernare; ac ad quoscumque etiam sacros & Presbyteratus ordines promoverè, & in illis, aut per eos juxta licet minùs ritè susceptis Ordinibus, etiam in Altaris ministerio ministrare, necnon munus consecrationis suscipere, & illo uti liberè & licitè valeant, dispensare etiam liberè & licitè possis, plenam & liberam apostolicam auctoritatem per præsentem concedimus facultatem & potestatem.* For what could these words mean, licet minùs ritè susceptis ordinibus, if not, that in conferring the Priesthood, the ordinary Laws of the Church were not observ'd, thing essential excepted which they always suppos'd? Ne

vertheless, by this Hypothesis the Legates are admitted to reinstate them, and for the Priests thus reinstated to serve in their order, and to receive episcopal Consecration, without receiving the Priesthood a new. Can any thing be more particular upon this head?

There is yet something that is still stronger. For, if we believe *Camden*, notwithstanding all the changes made since the Reformation in the offices and public Liturgies; *Rome* was so far from regarding these alterations as essential, and consequently was so little determin'd to a re-ordination, that one of the Conditions which *Abbe Vincent Parpaglia*, who was privately sent by the Pope to *Queen Elizabeth*, offer'd on his part to that Princess, if she would return unto his Obedience to approve her Liturgy; that is to say, the Book of Common-Prayer. <sup>2</sup> *Fama obtinet Pontificem fidem dedisse—Liturgiam Anglicam sua autoritate confirmaturum—dummodo illa Ecclesiæ Romanæ se aggregaret, Romanæque Cathedræ Primatum agnosceret.*

They ought not, therefore, to plead the invalidity of the Ordinations made in the reign of King *Edward*, on the score of the re-ordinations prescrib'd in *Queen Mary's* time, for two reasons. The first is, because they were not uniform upon this head, and that there was a time when they thought them valid, as it appears from the Ordinances of *Queen Mary*, *Boner's* articles of Visitation; and farther still, from the plenary power granted by *Julius the third*, to his Legate Cardinal *Pole*, and the offers made by *Pius the fourth* to *Queen Elizabeth*. The second reason is, since in that reign the consecrations of the Bishops under *Henry the eighth*, after his Schism, were charg'd equally with invalidity, as we may see by the degradations of *Latimer*, *Ridley* and *Farrar*, who had been consecrated according to the *Roman Pontifical*, and whom they were contented only to degrade from the Priesthood, under pretence that they were not Bishops. Now every body agrees, at this day, that

<sup>2</sup> Annal. Eliz. part 1. p. 59.



these Bishops were validly consecrated, and that their consecration could not, without error, be tax'd with invalidity. It is therefore not at all surprising that these Divines were mistaken about King *Edward's* Ordinations; and their opinion upon this matter, or rather the re-ordinations made upon such an authority, cannot be urg'd to our prejudice in the decision of this question.

The sentiments of the Divines who have oppos'd themselves against the Ordinations perform'd under Queen *Elizabeth*, have no better foundation to build upon, because their reasons depend upon two facts absolutely false. The leaders, in this debate, rejected these Ordinations, because that, according to them, they were not perform'd agreeably to the Laws, and because those who had consecrated the new Bishops were themselves no Bishops. On the other side, the argument of later Divines is, that these Ordinations had no validity, because the first Ordinations which they had receiv'd, were incompetent, having been perform'd in a Tavern, without ceremony, without form, without solemnity, and contrary to all the Laws.

If these two facts are false, they can have no well grounded reason to support the necessity of re-ordinations. Now it is certain, and I believe it is demonstrated in the second Chapter, that the new Bishops were consecrated according to the Laws, and that the History of the Tavern is a Fable, to which even an air of truth has not been given; which at least is necessary to cause it to be swallow'd down. After what has been already said, it is altogether unnecessary to enlarge anew upon this subject; and I shall content my self to repeat in few words, that this Fable destroys itself, by the silence of cotemporary Authors, by its opposition to the publick Registers, by the contradictions found among those who have published it, by its inconsistency with itself; and in short, because there was neither any necessity, nor advantage,

age, for the Protestants to have recourse to an Ordination of this kind; and that on the contrary, all prudential reasons, and even human policy decry it. So that how can such a story be sustain'd? Can a Man upon such a foundation build the necessity of re-ordination?

The other fact is no less false: For to be ordain'd according to Law, there must be three things: A Minister duly consecrated, the matter and essential form, and an Ordinal authoris'd by the national Church, who establishes her own proper Ceremonies. Now this is all found in the Ordination of the new Bishops. The Consecrator was consecrated, as it is prov'd in the third, fourth and fifth Chapters. The matter and essential form was exactly observ'd, as one may see in the sixth and seventh Chapters, where it is prov'd at large, that imposition of Hands and Prayer, which, by the consent of the best Divines, are the alone essence of Ordination, were strictly observ'd in *Parker's* Ordination; and that the changes made in the Ordinal, could not alter the substance of the consecration. In fine, the Rite of the Church prescrib'd by the Laws to make a religious Ceremony, was regularly observ'd in these Ordinations; and it is plainly prov'd in the eighth Chapter, that the Laws were before establish'd when the new Bishops were ordain'd under *Elizabeth*; and if it be sufficient to ascertain the validity of the Ordinations perform'd under *King Edward*, it ought not to be disputed as to those under *Queen Elizabeth*.

I know that *Stapleton*, *Harding*, and other catholic Writers, cotemporary with *Parker*, have affirm'd to the faces of the new Bishops, that they were not true Bishops; that their consecration was a chimæra, and that they could not prove their Ordination; having receiv'd it from a Man whose Ordination was equally unsustainable.

It is in reality true, that these Divines urg'd all these things, and that they did it boldly; but in truth

## 256 A DEFENCE of the Validity

truth upon what reasons? It was, in the first place, upon this that these Bishops had receiv'd their Ordination from Bishops engag'd in a Schism, as *Harding* says, <sup>a</sup> *Qui alios ordinare eo tempore præsumebant, erant ipsi omnino sine Ordine, ministrantes Ordines non secundum Ecclesiæ Catholicæ ritum, quippe qui omnium Episcoporum in orbe Christiano successionem abjicientes, novam congregationem propriæ suæ plantationis sibi erexerunt.* It is, Secondly, upon this account *Parker* was said not to be ordain'd, because not by the catholick Bishops. <sup>b</sup> *Dicis Episcopos vestros per Archiepiscopi triumque aliorum Episcoporum consecrationem creatos esse, sed Archiepiscopus ipse quomodo, quæso, consecratus fuit? Et qui fuerunt tres illi in toto Regno Episcopi qui manus illi imposuerunt? — Nam Metropolitanus vester, qui omnium vestrum consecrationes autoritate sua confirmare deberet, legitimam consecrationem minimè obtinuit. Fuerunt quidem in Regno Episcopi legitimi, qui vel non fuerunt requisiti manus vobis imponere, vel requisiti illud facere recusarunt.* In fine, it is for this reason, that they did not observe the Pontifical, only in the imposition of Hands and Prayer; and that they either retrench'd, or alter'd all that the objector thought essential. <sup>c</sup> *Quod clarè demonstrat vos talem consecrationem, quæ in usu semper fuerat, non quæsisse; sed aliam novam, quam omnes antiqui Episcopi despiciebant.* Now, are these reasons proper to convince a Man that *Parker* was no Bishop, and so consequently all those whom he had ordain'd? The two former reasons prove, that all the Bishops ordain'd in Schism and Heresy, are not validly consecrated; a Doctrine now look'd upon as false by all catholick Divines. The *Third* is, that a bare change of the Rite alters the substance of Sacraments; a pretence which destroys itself, and which the practice of Churches alone refutes, without any necessity of an enlargement upon it to shew its falsity.

<sup>a</sup> *Harding* detect. error. Juell. p. 129.  
<sup>c</sup> *Ib.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* p. 234.



Besides, it is of some weight to observe; that as all the Divines of those times were persuaded, the essence of Ordination not only consisted in the imposition of Hands, but also in the Unction, in the imposition of the Book of the Evangelists, and in the delivery of the Instruments; and that this sentiment is not so abandon'd, but that some Schoolmen of our age, against all probability, have maintain'd it: Being persuaded of the truth of this opinion, they could not judge favourably of the validity of an Ordination, where, excepting imposition of Hands and Prayer, all the rest were omitted, which they thought equally essential. And it was a necessary consequence, that they ought not regard them as Bishops, whose Ordination wanted some things which they imagin'd absolutely necessary.

But being at this day better acquainted with Tradition, that it is beyond dispute, that imposition of Hands and Prayer, join'd to the Rites prescrib'd by each Church in order to make this ceremony an act of Religion, are the only matter and form essential to Ordination: Can we be prejudic'd by the opinion of these Divines against the validity of the Ordinations made under Queen *Elizabeth*? And ought we not, on the contrary, to determine that they are mistaken, and that these Ordinations are very valid? For to conclude in few words this answer, one ought not to submit to an opinion, prejudicial to these Ordinations, founded upon false reasonings. Now the sentiment of the Divines, who oppose these Ordinations, is founded upon false reasons, or false facts; that is to say, either upon the Fable of the *Nagshhead*, or upon the error of a necessity of re-ordaining those who have been ordain'd in Schism or Heresy; or else in short, upon a false opinion, which besides imposition of Hands, requires, as necessary, several Ceremonies, the necessity whereof is destroy'd by all that is most authentick in the antient ecclesiastical Monuments.

258 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

The only prejudice that remains, for us to encounter with, is the modern practice of the Church of *Rome*, which re-ordains all the *English* Ministers that re-unite themselves to the catholic Church. This prejudice might indeed stop us, if in this affair we could be determin'd by the respect which is due to an authority so venerable as that of the Church of *Rome*. But here are two observations to be made: The *First* is, that by the Bull of *Julius* the *third* to Cardinal *Pole*, which we have already quoted, it appears that the practice of the Church of *Rome* has varied upon this head, and that she has not as yet made it a principle fix'd and agreed upon as to the particular fact in question. The *Second* is, that there having been at *Rome* no new discussion, nor any juridical solemn enquiry into this difficulty, no consequence ought to be drawn from the present practice, which ought not to determine us in such a manner, that we should make this usage the standard of our decision.

There is reason to believe, that the conduct of that Church would not have varied upon this Article, but because the *English* Catholics would have the Fable of the *Nagshhead* \* believ'd, because they had publish'd confidently, that the first new Bishops were not consecrated by true Bishops: For we have seen, that the catholic Divines cotemporary with Queen *Elizabeth* peremptorily refus'd to own, as true Bishops, those who had not been ordain'd by the catholic Prelates. These reasons, which could not be destroy'd but by the facts which they were ignorant of at *Rome*, and which the *English* did not much concern themselves to publish; and having once wav'd that, it was impossible but that these Ordinations should be thought invalid, where it was believ'd that all was omitted which was thought essential, and in

\* This, which I have advanc'd but as a conjecture, is confirm'd anew, by a Letter of the learned M. Fontanini to one of my correspondents.

which there was neither found a minister, nor the matter, nor a form, which could be receiv'd. It is upon the same principle, that M. l'Abbe Renaudot, and those of our Writers who have treated of this matter, have rejected the *English* Ordinations. But after a fresh discovery of the facts, can a Man maintain a decision manifestly founded upon false facts and frivolous Principles?

But, if these facts, and the reasons, upon which the present practice of the Church of *Rome* is founded, were solid, as they are not, one cannot make even the practice of that Church a rule which ought to be follow'd blindly upon this point; otherwise it is certain, that upon this very subject, in another case, a Man must inevitably deceive himself. Every body knows the History of the Popes *Formosus* and *Constantine*. After the death of *Formosus*, *Stephen* the sixth his successor, and his enemy, caus'd him to be dug up, and at the head of his Council, having declar'd the Ordinations null which he had administer'd, he caus'd all those to be re-ordain'd whom he had order'd. <sup>d</sup> *Cunctos quos ipse ordinaverat*, says the Historian, *gradu proprio depositos iterum ordinavit*. *John* the eleventh annull'd all that *Stephen* had done. *Sergius* the third, who succeeded *John*, renew'd all that *Stephen* had done against *Formosus*, and caus'd his Ordinations to be declar'd null over again. But in fine, all was made up under his successors, and there was no regard had to the irregular practice of that Church.

Somewhat of the same kind formerly happen'd with respect to *Constantine*. This Pope having intruded into the holy See, and keeping possession one year and one month, during that time he administer'd several Ordinations. But *Stephen* the fourth having been canonically elected, *Constantine* was shut up in a Monastery, after which his Eyes were put out. It was afterwards under deliberation, what

<sup>d</sup> Luitpr. Diac. lib. 1. Hist. c. 8.



ought to be done with those whom he had ordain'd: And it was resolv'd in a numerous Synod, where even several *French* Bishops were present, having been call'd to *Rome* upon this subject, that the Ordinations should be deem'd null. <sup>e</sup> *In eodem Concilio promulgatum est, says Anastasius the Librarian, ut Episcopi illi, quos ipse Constantinus consecraverat, si eorum aliquis Presbyter aut Diaconus fuerit, in pristinum honoris sui gradum reverterentur, & si placibiles fuissent coram populo civitatis suæ denuo facto decreto electionis more solito cum clero & plebe ad Apostolicam advenissent sedem, & ab eo S.S. Stephano Papa benedictionis susciperent consecrationem: Presbyteri verò illi ac Diaconi ab eodem Constantino consecrati simili modo in eo quo prius existabant habitu reverterentur, & postmodum, si qui eorum placibiles exstitissent, antefatus B. Pontifex Presbyteros eos aut Diaconos consecraret.*

I agree that, as *Auxilius* very well observes, bad examples must never have consequences drawn from them. <sup>f</sup> *Nunquam à malis exemplum est sumendum; ex his enim quæ in voluminibus leguntur, ea solummodò imitanda & facienda sunt quæ bona esse probantur; mala autem penitus execranda sunt & omnino cavenda.* So that I do not pretend to make a Law of that which was practis'd upon these two occasions; but I, on the contrary, barely conclude, that what is done at *Rome* is not always the rule of what we ought to do; and that since she decided wrong with respect to the Ordinations of *Constantine* and *Formosus*, the practice introduc'd, to re-ordain the *English* Bishops, appears to be no more just, nor better founded; and that therefore, according to *St. Augustine's* Maxim, "greater regard is to be had to reason than examples." <sup>g</sup> *Sana quippe ratio etiam exemplis anteponenda est.*

Perhaps it may be said, that there is this difference between what was done at *Rome*, as to *Constantine*

<sup>e</sup> Anastas. in Steph. IV.

<sup>f</sup> Aux. lib. de Ord. Form. cap. 4.

<sup>g</sup> Aug. de Civit. Dei lib. 2. cap. 23.

*of the* English ORDINATIONS. 261

and *Formosus*, and that which is done with regard to the *English*; that in the two former cases they acted by passion; but instead of that, in the latter, the ecclesiastical Rules are follow'd: That besides, *Constantine* and *Formosus* observ'd all that is prescrib'd in the administration of Orders but that the *English* have revers'd all the form, and all the antient ceremonial, prescrib'd and practis'd in the catholick Church; and that what appears defective in the decisions against the Ordinations of these two Pontifs, becomes legitimate with regard to the re-ordinations of the *English*.

But whatever supposition is made, it is always certain that that which is done at *Rome*, is no sure rule as to what we ought to do. The more favourably the cause of *Formosus* and *Constantine* is thought of, the more manifest my proposition is: For, if she was mistaken in those cases where there was less difficulty, it is not impossible, but that in this here, where the facts are embarras'd, and where she may mistake by reason of the difficulty of clearing and being assur'd of the truth, when so many Authors conspire to blemish and obscure it.

Moreover, I know not whether it be so certain as it is affirm'd to be, that in the affair of the re-ordinations, directed in the Instances of *Formosus* and *Constantine*, that passion principally dictated those resolutions. It is true, that in *Stephen* the *sixth*, and *Sergius* the *third*, there was really animosity and passion enough: But, is it equally certain that all the Bishops, who had an hand in the decisions made in the Councils that were assembled, had espous'd all their hatred and animosity? Can it be easily believ'd, that the *French* themselves, who were call'd to that Synod, held under *Stephen* the *fourth* against *Constantine*, decided no otherwise than by passion? And, is there not more room to believe that this question has not been yet rightly determin'd? A Man ought not to be surpriz'd, that they may be mistaken at *Rome*  
S 3 upon

## 262 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

upon this subject, and that their sentiments have been much divided, as *Sigebert* in his *Chronicle* bears witness. <sup>h</sup> “ This question and controversy was  
 “ much debated in the Church with great scandal,  
 “ for many years ; some prejudging, that *Formosus*’s  
 “ consecration, and those ordain’d by him, ought to  
 “ be deem’d null : On the contrary, others more  
 “ prudently determin’d, that whatever *Formosus* was,  
 “ yet for the dignity of the sacerdotal office, and  
 “ the orthodoxy of those whom he had ordain’d, all  
 “ his consecrations ought to have been ratified.”  
 But, however it is sufficient for me to have prov’d,  
 by these examples, that the practice of the Church of  
*Rome* is no more than a prejudice, against which it  
 may be always lawful to object, and that one can-  
 not conclude from it any thing demonstrative against  
 the *English* Ordinations, no more than from that  
 which was done under *Queen Mary*, or from what  
 those *English* have thought, who have attack’d the va-  
 lidity of *Parker*’s Ordination.

---

### CHAP. XIV.

*A continuation of the same subject: The Re-  
 ordaining of the English is contrary to all  
 the receiv’d Principles maintain’d in the  
 Schools upon the subject of Re-ordinations.*

**W**E have seen that no use can be made of the  
 re-ordinations of Bishops since the Reformati-  
 on, against the validity of the *English* Ordinations.

<sup>h</sup> Cum multo Scandalo multa per multos annos quæstio &  
 controversia est agitata in Ecclesia, aliis ejus & ab eo ordina-  
 torum consecrationem irritam esse debere præjudicantibus, ali-  
 is è contra qualiscumque fuerit *Formosus*, tamen propter sa-  
 cerdotalis officii dignitatem, & fidem eorum qui ordinati fue-  
 rant, omnes consecrationes ejus ratas esse debere, saniori consilio  
 judicantibus.—*Sigebert. Chron. Ad Ann. 900.*



## *of the English ORDINATIONS.* 263

I proceed further now, which is no difficult performance, to prove that these re-ordinations are contrary to all the receiv'd Principles maintain'd in the Church, and in the Schools upon this head. It is certain, that it was a long while doubtful, which part to take in this matter. The decision of the question which regards the reiteration of Baptism should, in appearance, serve to regulate in the other Sacraments ; which, like this, are not to be reiterated. Nevertheless, several Divines continu'd to doubt, even to the twelfth and thirteenth Century, whether an unlawful Ordination ought to be held as good, and some have roundly deny'd it.

But it must be acknowledg'd, that since that time, the opinion contrary to re-ordinations got the upper hand, because it was not defin'd by any express decree of the Church, it not being regarded as strictly belonging to the Faith. This opinion truly is built upon reasons so solid, that it is natural to submit to them. For, 1. It is unanimously agreed, that every Sacrament that impresses a Character ; that is to say, which implies in it a sort of consecration, ought not to be reiterated : And about this there was never any difficulty. It is not worth our while to examine whether Ordination imprints a character, since all agree it does, and since it is this which *St. Augustine* brings to support the validity of Ordination as well as Baptism. <sup>i</sup> “ As the baptiz'd, says this Father, “ if he departs from the unity loses not the Sacrament of Baptism ; so also a person ordain'd, if “ he leaves the unity, does not lose the power of “ conveying a true Baptism ; for we must not de- “ tract from any Sacrament.” It is true, the Father speaks here only of those who had been ordain'd a-

<sup>i</sup> Sicut baptizatus, si ab unitate recesserit, Sacramentum Baptismi non amittit, sic etiam ordinatus, si ab unitate recesserit, Sacramentum dandi Baptismum non amittit, nulli enim Sacramento injuria facienda est.— *August. Lib. 1. de Bapt. cont. Donat. c. 1.*

mong the Catholicks ; but he goes yet a further length in his Books against the Epistle of *Parmenian*. For he there proves, that those who had been even ordain'd among the Hereticks, were validly ordain'd, as those who are baptiz'd in Heresy are validly baptiz'd. <sup>k</sup> *Utrumque enim sacramentum est, says he, & quadam consecratione utrumque homini datur, illud cum baptizatur, istud cum ordinatur : ideoque in Catholica utrumque non licet iterari. Nam si quando ex ipsa parte venientes etiam prapofiti pro bono pacis, correcto Schismatis errore, suscepti sunt, & si visum est opus esse ut eadem officia gererent quæ gerebant, non sunt rursus ordinati : Sed sicut Baptismus in eis, ita Ordinatio mansit integra, quia in præcisione fuerat vitium, quod unitatis pace correctum est ; non in Sacramentis, quæ ubicumque sunt, ipsa sunt.*

A second Principle admitted as indisputable in the Schools as to this matter is, that the conferring of a Sacrament out of the Church, does not render that Sacrament invalid, at least, when nothing is omitted that is of the essence of that Sacrament. And, in that case, it would be the omission which made the Sacrament invalid, and not the conferring it out of the Church. This Principle is a consequence of the Doctrine of a Character ; and tho' it has been contested formerly by those who disown'd the impression of any character out of the Church, there is now no further hesitation in admitting it upon the Principles of *St. Augustine* against the *Donatists* ; where he proves, that where there are Sacraments, they ought to be receiv'd ; *Ubicumque sunt, ipsa sunt*, and that the dissensions of Men destroy not the gifts of God, according to *Optatus*, <sup>l</sup> *Tho' the Minds of Men are at variance, the Sacraments are not.*

A third Principle receiv'd by Divines is, that we must upon this point reason of Ordination in the same manner as of Baptism. This Maxim was not

<sup>k</sup> *August. lib. 1. cont. Ep. Parm. cap. 13.* <sup>l</sup> *Et si hominum litigant mentes, non litigant Sacramenta. Optat. lib. 3. parag. 9.*

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 265

always universally receiv'd. *Urban the second* would not admit of a parity between these two Sacraments. <sup>m</sup> *Alia in Baptismo*, says he, & *alia in reliquis Sacramentis consideratio est*. And *Gratian*, in his Decretal, expressly denies that there is any thing to be concluded from one to the other. <sup>n</sup> *Patet ergo illud Augustini*, says he, *Sacramenta videlicet Christi per hæreticos ministrata suo non carere effectū, non de omnibus intelligi generaliter, sed de sacramento Baptismi*. And, continuing in the same sentiment, he adds, <sup>o</sup> *Patet quod Sacramenta ecclesiastica præter Baptisma ab hæreticis ministrari non possunt*: And, out of an apprehension lest it should be imagin'd that he meant this of a suspension, and not of an intire defect of power, explaining what *St. Augustine* says, that the power annex'd to a Character is not lost by Schism, he maintains that *St. Augustine*, says so only of those who had receiv'd their Ordination in the Church, and not in the Heresy or the Schism. <sup>p</sup> *De his ergo qui accepta sacerdotali potestate ab unitate Catholica Ecclesiæ recedunt, loquitur Augustinus, non de illis qui in Schismate vel hæresi positi, sacerdotalem unctionem accipiunt*.

It must nevertheless be acknowledg'd that the antients have thought otherwise; for, besides what we have produc'd out of *St. Augustine*, *St. Gregory the Great* is very express, writing to *John Bishop of Ravenna*. <sup>q</sup> "But what you say, that he who has been ordain'd, should be again ordain'd is very ridiculous; and far be it from you, my Brother, to think so: For, as he who was once baptiz'd, ought not again to be baptiz'd: So he who is once consecrated, ought not to be consecrated again into the same Order." The third Council of

<sup>m</sup> Epist. ad. Luc. 5. Juv. præp. apud. Baron. An. 1099.

<sup>n</sup> Decret. p. 2. c. 1. qu. 1. can. 45. <sup>o</sup> Can. 74. <sup>p</sup> Can.

97. <sup>q</sup> Illud autem quod dicitis, ut is qui ordinatus est, iterum ordinetur, valde ridiculum est. Absit autem à fraternitate vestrà sic sapere. Sicut enim baptizatus semel, iterum baptizari non debet; ita qui consecratus est semel, in eodem iterum Ordine non debet consecrari, *Gregor. M. lib. 2. Ep. 32.*



## 266 A DEFENCE of the Validity

Carthage also makes the same comparison between the reiteration of Baptism and that of Ordination. <sup>r</sup> *Illud suggerimus mandatum nobis, quod etiam in Capuensi plenariâ Synodo videtur statutum: non licet fieri rebaptisationes & reordinationes.* As to the rest, the foundation of this comparison is very solid: For, that which makes the price and value of Baptism, given in the Church, is because it is conferr'd in the Name of *Jesus Christ*, and because the faith or infidelity of a Minister neither adds to nor takes away any thing from the gifts of God; the same reasons hold good as to Ordination, and a Man must necessarily reason of the one as he does of the other. It is upon this foot, that Divines have return'd to the Maxims of St. *Augustine* and St. *Gregory*, and have absolutely renounc'd the doubts which formerly divided the Schoolmen upon this head, as the master of the Sentences has observ'd. <sup>r</sup> *Hanc quæstionem perplexam ac pene insolubilem faciunt Doctorum verba, qui plurimum dissentire videntur.*

A fourth Principle receiv'd as unquestionable in the Schools is, that to reiterate a Sacrament, there must either be the positive decree of the Church, or else a plain nullity in the administration of it, or at least a solid and evident doubt. This Principle follows the preceding, and is founded even upon the nature of the thing: For if the reiteration of a Sacrament be criminal when validly conferr'd, it ought not to take place, but where the Church has determin'd it by a solemn decree, that the first administration is null, or that the thing is clear in itself, or in short, that the doubt be so solid, that one cannot apply to it the Maxim of St. *Leo*, "That a thing is not look'd upon as reiterated, which does not at all appear to have been done." <sup>r</sup> *Quod non ostenditur gestum, ratio non finit ut videatur iteratum—quoniam non potest iterationis crimen venire, quod factum esse omnino nesci-*

<sup>r</sup> Carth. 3. Can. 37.  
& 135.

<sup>r</sup> Distinc. 25.

<sup>r</sup> Leo Mag. Ep. 2.

tur. But, to establish solidly a doubt of this kind, according to St. Leo it must happen, that there be no proofs, no marks which may conduct us to a knowledge of the thing. *Si nulla existant indicia— Si nemo sit penitus qui testimonio suo possit juvare ignorantiam nescientis.* For otherwise the doubt will not be sufficient to authorize the reiteration of a Sacrament in other circumstances, save in the last extremity. *Nisi forte supremus finis immineat.*

In short, the last Principle, at this day receiv'd into the Schools as certain, is, that in Ordination, as in other Sacraments, there are several things which do not belong to the essence of them, and which may be omitted without any bad consequence.

Morinus goes off from this, and maintains without any probability, that the Ceremonies which are added to the parts which are the substance of the Sacraments, become themselves essential by the choice which the Church has made of them. <sup>u</sup> *In ritu Ordinationis sacra, says this Father, quadam esse divina institutionis & traditionis, quæ omni Ordini sacro semper & ubique conveniunt, veluti manus impositio, & oratio conveniens, quæ & Scriptura Sacra nobis tradidit, & Ecclesiæ praxis semper & ubique usurpavit. Quædam verò Ecclesiasticæ institutionis, quæ licet mutari possint, & pro temporum & Regionum varietate aliter atque aliter observari, tanti tamen sunt momenti, quamdiu ab Ecclesiâ revocata aut abrogata non sunt, ut eorum ommissio Ordinationem reddat non modò inhonestam & illicitam, sed etiam irritam & nullam, omnique effectui & gratiâ cassam. Illa autem omnia hujusmodi conditiones sunt, materiam Sacramenti sic afficientes & determinantes, ut earum defectu, materia reddatur Ordinationi inepta.* But this opinion of F. Morin is ill founded; and there is hardly any Divine who does not make a distinction between what is of the essence of a Sacrament, and that which is properly the Ceremony: A distinction which could

<sup>u</sup> Morinus de Sacr. Ordin. p. 3. Ex. 5. c. 9. p. 104.

have no existence, if a ceremony when prescrib'd by the Church becomes an essential part of Ordination.

It is time now to proceed to the application of these Principles, and to prove that they are incompatible with the re-ordinations of the *English*, who have been ordain'd according to the *English* Ordinal.

By the first Principle, every Sacrament that imprints a Character ought not to be reiterated, even when it is administer'd out of the Church ; because that, according to the second Principle, the administration of a Sacrament out of the Church, does not render that Sacrament null, at least, when nothing essential is omitted in that Sacrament. Now, agreeable to the first Principle, Ordination imprints a Character : For, according to St. *Augustine*, it is a sort of Consecration equivalent to that of Baptism. *\* Utrumque enim Sacramentum est, & quâdam consecratione utrumque homini datur : illud cum baptizatur, istud cum ordinatur ; ideoque in Catholica non licet iterari.* It is therefore unlawful to reordain the *English*, at least, when nothing essential can be prov'd to be wanting, or defective.

For, according to the fifth Principle, we must distinguish, in conferring of Sacraments, that which is essential from that which ought to be regarded only as a bare Ceremony, since that all does not equally belong to the substance. Now it is prov'd in the sixth and seventh Chapters, that there was nothing essential omitted in *Parker's* Consecration, and that what was omitted ought not to pass for such.

It therefore does not appear, that a Man can have any scruple upon this head, forasmuch as by the third Principle, one ought to reason of Ordination in the same manner as he does about Baptism. Now, in reasoning about Ordination as of Baptism, it is evident, that one ought to acknowledge the validity of the *English* Ordinations, not only because both the one and the other imprints a Character, but also be-

\* Aug. lib. 2. cont. Parm. cap. 13.



cause that in the new *English* Liturgy, the same re-trenchments are made in the administration of Baptism, as are in that of Ordination. For, as in Ordination, the Unctions, the imposing the Evangelists, the delivery of the Instruments, and all that which did not appear essential is taken away; there is the like alteration in the administration of Baptism, the Exorcisms, the Unctions, the most part of the signings of the Cross, the use of the Salt, and the greatest part of the other Ceremonies, preserving only the immersion of the baptiz'd, or the pouring of Water upon his Head join'd with the words appointed for the valid administration of that Sacrament: Now the Baptism of the *English* is receiv'd, notwithstanding the abolition made of Ceremonies, certainly more antient than all those us'd in Ordination: One therefore ought not to hesitate about the reception of their Orders, unless a Man have different weights and measures for determining his judgment in matters of Religion.

If there were any doubt about this matter, it ought not to be one that is ill founded. Now by our fourth Principle, to repeat a Sacrament, there must be either a solemn decree of the Church, or a visible nullity, or at least a solid reasonable doubt; and this is what one does not meet with here. For first, there is no decree of the Church that declares the *English* Ordinations null. It is true, that in some particular Churches it is thought, by reason of ill-grounded prejudices, a duty to re-ordain those who have been ordain'd in *England* since the Schism; and that even at *Rome* this practice is observ'd. But for this a Man hears of no rule, and it is done without discussing the question, without examining the facts, and because they receive for truths accounts that are the most false and the most fabulous. Nevertheless, there is no prescription against truth; and it is always seasonable to endeavour to know those things which we were ignorant of before.

There

There is no visible nullity. The matter and essential forms are found to have been us'd in these Ordinations. The publick Records bear testimony to the publick manner and solemnity of the Ceremony ; there are the Names of the Consecrators, and there is a detail of all that was done, and all that was practis'd upon this occasion. The imposition of Hands, among the rest, and Prayer, are there expressly related ; therefore there is no visible nullity. What weighs for the most part with those who contest the validity of the *English* Ordinations is, that they satisfy themselves with a doubt, and pretend it is so solid, that it is of itself sufficient without other nullities to render the *English* Ordinations invalid, or at least, to induce us to act with regard to those who have receiv'd this Ordination, as if it was really null and invalid. But we have prov'd in the twelfth Chapter, that this doubt, in the circumstances that accompany it, is not sufficient to authorize the reordination of the *English*, and does not prevent our falling into what St. *Leo* calls the " Guilt of reiteration." *In iterationis Crimen.*

The application of these Principles is so easy and so natural, that I do not see how the force of them can be evaded. Every body agrees, that Order imprints a Character, that the administration of it out of the Church is not sufficient to hinder the impression ; that, in conferring a Sacrament, no regard ought to be had but only to things essential, and to the Rite that makes it a religious Ceremony : That in Ordination, imposition of Hands and Prayer, are the only essential parts, and that all this was observ'd in the ordination of the *English* Bishops ; upon what account then can the validity of these Ordinations be contested ?

A Man must necessarily resolve to take one of these two sides ; and to maintain either that the things essential were not observ'd in the ordination of the new Bishops, or that, to make an Ordination

valid,

valid, what was practis'd at all times, and in all places must not only be observ'd, that is to say, that in the administration of the Sacraments, not only the divine or apostolical Institution, but also all the Church has thought fit to add to it, in such a manner, that it may not be permitted to any Church to alter any thing. *y Quædam verò Ecclesiasticæ institutionis, quæ licet mutari possint, & pro temporum & regionum varietate aliter atque aliter observari, tanti tamen sunt momenti, ut eorum omissio Ordinationem reddat non modo inhonestam & illicitam, sed etiam irritam & nullam, omnique effectu & gratiâ cassam, as the learned Morinus observes.*

But this alternative is indefensible in both its parts. The first is already shewn to be so, by proving that King Edward's Ordinal has retain'd all that is essential in the Pontifical, that is to say, the Consecrator, the imposition of Hands and Prayer; and that in the opinion of the most learned Divines, none of the other Ceremonies have either the antiquity, or the universality necessary to make them to be reputed as essential parts of this Sacrament: That by the Instrument of Parker's consecration, it is evident that none of these latter have been omitted; and that therefore it cannot be prov'd that the essential parts were not observ'd: This has been so fully demonstrated, that it is needless to dwell any longer upon it. But what remains here is, to prove against Morinus, that the non-observance of the rest of the Ceremonies, does not render an Ordination invalid, but barely illegitimate.

Morinus appears before quoted against himself; but to what purpose, if he thought the non-observation of the Ceremonies prescrib'd by the Ritual, or the Pontifical, affected the validity of a Sacrament? Why, say they, in speaking of the matter and forms in particular, does he lay down what they consisted in, and distinguish that which belongs to the

*y Morinus de Sacr. Ordin. part. 3. Exerc. 5. cap. 9.*

substance,



substance, and that which does not, as one may see from the passages by me produc'd, speaking of the imposition of Hands and the Form: *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, of which he says, *nullâ ratione dici possunt ad Ordinis substantiam pertinere*? For, if the Rite altogether be of such importance, to use his own expressions, that an omission renders the Ordination not only unlawful but invalid, he is pleas'd to distinguish to no purpose, what belongs to the substance, and what does not; all, according to him, equally belongs to it, *as long as they are not revers'd or abrogated by the Church.*

But without staying to reconcile this Author with himself, it is convenient to examine the thing independently from his opinion. Now, I demand if there is any Divine who believes that the Rites approv'd by the Church, may be in such a manner essential to the validity of a Sacrament, that the matter and forms being apply'd without being accompanied with these Rites, there is no Sacrament conferr'd? This proposition, which in one sense may be true, yet is absolutely false in that of *Morinus's*, which is what I am only concern'd to confute; and as there is a necessity to clear up this matter, it must be seen in what sense it may be true or false, in order to make a just application.

To the end that a Sacrament may be conferr'd, the intention must be joyn'd to the matter and form. All the world agree in it. There is a dispute in the Schools as to the interior or exterior intention: But this is not what is treated of here, where the exterior intention shall satisfy us. This exterior intention shews itself by the practice and observation of a religious Rite prescrib'd by the Church, and one cannot otherwise judge of it. When in certain circumstances this Rite is omitted, one may pronounce with all the assurance imaginable, that the intention is wanting; and the judgment is neither false nor yet rash. It is precisely under these circumstances that  
the

the proposition of *Morinus* is true, that the omission of ecclesiastical Ceremonies renders the Sacrament null; because, as he judiciously observes: <sup>2</sup> “ Yet “ all these are conditions of that kind, so affecting “ and determining the matter of a Sacrament, that “ by a defect of them, the matter of Ordination may “ be render’d invalid.” For, as the intention is essential to a Sacrament, and as this is not manifested but by the observation of the prescrib’d Ceremonies, the omission consequently causes a nullity.

The omission of Ceremonies may happen in another case, which is that of necessity. This necessity may arise from different accidents; such as the peril of death, or the want of Ministers, or even the things that make the matter of Ceremonies, and sometimes the fear of a persecution; and in a word, all that can give us an idea of a just necessity. By this hypothesis it appears to me, that none can doubt that the proposition of *Morinus* is false; and I do not know any Divine who would in this case maintain that the omission of Ceremonies render’d a Sacrament null. There are even other occasions, where, without any necessity, the omission of Ceremonies does not make Sacraments null, when in other respects the intention to do what the Church does shews itself; and it is this which proves that the only case is the defect of intention, which can render the observation of Ceremonies essential to a Sacrament. Some examples will clear this matter, and will serve to determine this difficulty.

In the administration of Baptism, Water is the matter, and the invocation of the holy Trinity is the form, in what manner soever pronounc’d, either in the form of a Prayer, or in form of a Wish or Commandment. If one ludicrously baptizes another, that is to say, if he throws Water upon him, invoking

<sup>2</sup> Illa autem omnia ejusmodi conditiones sunt, materiam Sacramenti sic afficientes & determinantes, ut earum defectu materia reddatur Ordinationi inepta. *Morin. lb. p. 104.*

## 274 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

the holy Trinity, this Baptism is nevertheless look'd upon as null, because the non-observance of the Ceremonies of Baptism proves, under this circumstance, that the intention did not accompany the application of the matter and form. On the contrary, the omission of the Ceremonies of Baptism in an imminent peril of death, does not hinder that the Baptism may not be receiv'd as valid; and even without the case of death, tho' one cannot but regard, as a great abuse, the delay of the Ceremonies of Baptism, to render the solemnity more august, as it often happens to the Children of great Lords; yet no body ever doubted, but that a Baptism of this kind was good, tho' it was conferr'd without the Ceremonies which ought to accompany it; because then, the intention was sufficiently manifested, and there was no doubt about the matter.

Thus in Ordination, it is known how pressing and strict the ecclesiastical Laws are, that require three Bishops for the consecration of a Bishop. This Law is at least as antient, as general, and as pressing as those which prescribe the Unctions, and the other Ceremonies which accompany Ordination. Nevertheless, in many instances, when necessity required, the Ordinations of one alone have been receiv'd as good, which had been rejected as null if the neglect of this Law had given room to believe that the intention of the consecrator was not the same with that of the Church. The practice of the Church, which has receiv'd, for good and valid, Sacraments administer'd without all the Ceremonies prescrib'd, therefore intirely decides against *Morinus*, and proves that Ceremonies may be omitted without endangering the validity of Sacraments; and this is effectually the opinion of all Divines.

There is a third case, where the omission of Ceremonies may take place: It is when the Church in general thinks it is proper to make alterations, or to take them away intirely; or when a particular Church



Church thinks it necessary not to confine herself to a Rite receiv'd for a long while, and she makes all the changes or retrenchments she pleases, nevertheless, constantly preserving what always pass'd for essential. In this case, the omission of a Ceremony alters not in any respect the validity of a Sacrament, as we have seen in the tenth Chapter. And *Morinus* himself freely owns it, speaking of the necessity of Ceremonies: "a Hence it follows, says he, that the matter of those Sacraments may be different, in different Churches, and that Matrimony, Absolution, and Ordination administer'd in some places may be null and void; which if they had been administer'd in the same manner, and with the same circumstances in other places, had been valid and lawful, as long as those conditions and circumstances, as we assume, are the practice of that Church, and impos'd as substantials. Every one therefore must follow the custom of the Church wherein he lives, unless he obtain licence from him who has authority for the granting of it." Now in supposing that a Church can change the Rites which she us'd, is not this to own in the highest degree, that she may authorize the omission of Ceremonies, without prejudice to the substance of a Sacrament.

In these two cases it is plain, that the Maxim of *Morinus* is intirely false; and it is astonishing, that he has no restriction, in the only case, where Ceremonies are necessary to manifest the intention of the Church. But that which has thrown him into an error is a second Maxim, as equivocal as the former;

a Hinc sequitur, Sacramentorum istorum materias in diversis Ecclesiis posse esse diversas, atque Matrimonium, Absolutionem, Ordinationem quibusdam in locis celebrata, irrita esse & nulla, quæ si eodem modo & cum iisdem circumstantiis facta fuissent aliis in locis, fuissent rata & legitima, dummodo conditiones illæ, & circumstantiæ, ut assumimus, sint ex usu illius Ecclesiæ, ut substantiales imperatæ. Unusquisque enim Ecclesiæ in qua vivit morem sequi tenetur, nisi licentiam à potestate habente sit consecutus, *Morin. Ib. p. 105.*

namely, that the Church may prescribe the conditions upon which the validity of a Sacrament in such a manner depends, that without them it cannot be thought to be conferr'd. <sup>b</sup> "In my opinion, says he, the Church can define upon what conditions an ordaining Bishop ought to use his power; the ordainer may insist upon certain qualifications in the person ordain'd, that he may receive from him a valid and effectual Ordination: So that if the ordainer or the ordained neglect this definition, and act against it, the act may be null and void, and that the effect be produc'd it must be reiterated."

As this Maxim is variable in some respects, it is by the application made of it, that one must determine whether it agrees with the particular case treated of. It is not my business to decide upon what the Church can or cannot do. But what concerns us to consider at present is, if the Church, before she declares the conditions laid down, without the observation of which, she will not regard as valid the Sacraments that are conferr'd, can declare Sacraments invalid, where the matter and form that have always been judg'd essential, has been preserv'd: If, for example, she can declare a Baptism to be void that is administred without any of the prescrib'd Ceremonies, excepting the use of the Water, and the invocation of the holy Trinity, together with an intention to do what the Church does: This is exactly our case, and it is by this it is to be decided, and the decision appears not to be very difficult.

For, according to the fifth Principle before laid down, there must be a distinction made between what is essential, and what does not belong to the substance of a Sacrament. Now, at least, before the

<sup>b</sup> Ecclesia meo iudicio d. finire potest quibus conditionibus ordinans Episcopus suâ autoritate uti debeat, quibusve cum donis & qualibus ordinandus sese ordinanti sistere, ut validè & efficaciter ordinem ab eo recipiat; ita ut si ordinans aut ordinandus definitionem hanc neglexerint, contraque egerint, nullo sit nulla & irrita, atque ut effectus producat iteranda. Ibid. p. 204.

Church declares herself one cannot look upon the conditions, as belonging to the substance of a Sacrament, which the Church has not prescrib'd under the penalty of declaring the Sacrament void. This proposition is allow'd by *Morinus* himself, when he says, that the Church may declare upon what conditions she will, that a Sacrament shall be receiv'd efficaciously ; that is to say, that the administration of it shall be valid. This declaration therefore renders the conditions necessary or it does not, and it is not in the Churches power to declare that invalid which is done before such declaration.

And indeed, if the case were not so, to what purpose are so many disputes that are rais'd in the Church upon the subject of the validity of Sacraments, receiv'd in Heresy and Schism ? Nothing appears to me more easy to determine. The Church has nothing to do but to declare them null, and by that means they would have been so, without running the risk of a reiteration ; a thing which always appear'd odious and criminal in the Church. But this never was the Maxim of our Fathers, all their attention was for the substance of a Sacrament ; that is to say, that which was establish'd by *Jesus Christ* or his Apostles : If they found it there, they did not believe that the Church would annul what *Jesus Christ* had establish'd ; and we do not find, for example, that in the question of Baptism, it was ever perform'd with any thing else than by the use of Water joyn'd to the invocation of the holy Trinity, without being in any pain, whether the other Ceremonies had been observ'd.

The instances of Matrimony and Penance alledg'd by *Morinus*, have no affinity with the particular case treated of. For, besides that these two Sacraments imprint nothing of a Character, or of a Consecration, which is a very essential difference ; it is yet further to be observ'd of Marriage, that it is not only a Sacrament, but there is also a civil contract, and a natural contract ; that it is in these two respects that



## 278 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

the Church, or even the Prince may interpose, because it is the Interest of Society to follow certain Laws, without which we bring Families into a dangerous confusion. If the Law hinders the validity of a contract, the Sacrament can take no place; since the Sacrament supposes an union, which cannot be among Persons whom the Laws hinder from contracting together. In a word, tho' these persons may have receiv'd the Rite of the Sacrament, yet, because it produces no effect upon them, it is null, the same as if it were unlawful, as it happens to all the Sacraments that do not impress a Character. The Church has chang'd nothing either in regard to the matter or the form, she has not made the Ceremonies which have been added an essential part of this Sacrament; but as it is necessary, to render all other contracts valid, to follow certain Laws, it is the same in Marriage; and if these Laws are not observ'd, the Sacrament has no effect, for want of a fit subject, the Laws having render'd these incapable of contracting.

It is much the same as to Penance. The Church adds nothing either to the matter or the form. The Ceremonies which accompany the administration of this Sacrament, are essential no further than they serve to manifest an intention to do what the Church intends should be done, as it is observ'd. There is nothing more now that belongs to the substance of the Sacrament than what belong'd to it formerly; that is to say, the imposition of Hands and the form of Absolution, of whatsoever sort it be. But as the Sacrament cannot be convey'd without Ministers, and without a Subject, it must be right that the Church declare who are the Subjects, and the Ministers of this Sacrament, without which the Sacrament is null; because the only effect of this Sacrament being Grace, and Grace being not conferr'd by a Sacrament administer'd or receiv'd unlawfully, there remains nothing but the Symbol; and it is null, tho' the Church has added nothing essential to the matter or the form.

These

These two examples therefore do not prove, that the Church can make the Ceremonies which she prescribes, become essential parts of a Sacrament; but they are yet less a proof that the Ceremonies, which she has not propos'd as essential, may become such in virtue of a subsequent declaration which she may make after the administration of the Sacraments. This is neither founded upon authority, nor yet upon reason. All the examples in sound antiquity are contrary to it; and if in the particular fact of Ordination there has been more variations, the conduct of re-ordaining has, in short, been declar'd contrary to the Principles of the Church, and besides her intention.

Now this is exactly our case; and to put the *English* Ordinations out of the reach of all reproach, there is nothing more to be done than to prove, that one cannot shew any decree of the Church, either a formal one, or even any thing equivalent to it, which has declar'd that the Ceremonies annex'd to the imposition of Hands and Prayer, should be look'd upon as the essential parts of the Sacrament of Orders, and that they belong to the substance of it. Now this argument is obvious, since it consists in a negative, which cannot be destroy'd, but by producing a decree of this kind, which never had any existence.

But moreover, it can be even shewn by positive proofs, that the Church never regarded these Ceremonies as an essential part of the Sacraments to which they are joyn'd; since the Council of *Trent* took so much care to determine what appear'd essential in the Sacrament, in that it has not given Rites and Ceremonies, but as things that are laudable, which may not be omitted, or despis'd without a Crime. <sup>c</sup> " If any one shall say, that the re-

<sup>c</sup> Si quis dixerit receptos & approbatos Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Ritus in solemni Sacramentorum administratione adhiberi consuetos, aut contemni, aut sine peccato à ministris pro libito omitti, aut in novos alios per quemcumque Ecclesiarum Pastorem mutari posse, anathema sit. Concil. Trid. Sess. 2. de Sacram. in genere, can. 13.

“ceiv’d and approv’d Rites of the Catholick Church,  
 “practis’d in the solemn administration of the Sacra-  
 “ments may be despis’d, or discretionarily omitted  
 “by Ministers without Sin, or exchang’d for others  
 “by any Pastor of the Church, let him be Anathe-  
 “ma.” It is thus that the same Council expresses it  
 self, when ever it would be understood that a Sacra-  
 ment is administer’d unlawfully, but not invalidly:  
 For otherwise it had been easy for the Council to  
 have added that the Rites were essential, and to  
 cause its Anathema to fall upon those who main-  
 tain’d that without these Ceremonies the Sacraments  
 were valid. But, no Divine has understood it in  
 this sense, and one does not see the Man who dares  
 maintain the necessity of Ceremonies for the validity  
 of a Sacrament.

I do not believe that this truth can be disputed,  
 that there is really no such decree as makes Ceremo-  
 nies essential to the validity of Sacraments: But, per-  
 haps it may be said, that the Church having declar’d  
 the Ordinations void perform’d according to King  
*Edward’s* Ritual, this is to declare, in a manner e-  
 quivalent, that the Ceremonies of the Pontifical are  
 necessary; or at least, if the Ordinations already ad-  
 minister’d were not annull’d, it sufficiently declares  
 that those which should be made according to that  
 form, should be reputed absolutely invalid.

This is really what may be said most plausibly up-  
 on this head; but, unfortunately, it is not true, that  
 there was a declaration of this kind made by the  
 Church upon the Ordinations administered by King  
*Edward’s* Ordinal; and on the contrary we have seen,  
 Chapter XIII that there was disagreement enough  
 at first upon this Article; and that even at *Rome*, *Ju-  
 lius* the *third* seems to have own’d their validity. It  
 is true, that under Queen *Mary*, those were again or-  
 dain’d who had been ordain’d by King *Edward’s* Ri-  
 tual: But, can one call this a decree of the Church?  
 And the opinion of some Bishops, sower’d by their  
 unjust



unjust deposition, and interest'd to pull down those who had oppos'd them upon the account of their adherence to the old Religion ; and besides that, animated perhaps with a zeal not well inform'd in the defence of the truth : I say, can this pass for a Rule, and an universal Law, which we are oblig'd to pay a respect to ?

Besides, as the Church has not pretended to innovate in that affair, and as since that time she has not determin'd that the Ceremonies which go along with the Ordination, were more requisite for its validity than before ; tho' the decree of the Church were produc'd, which certainly does not subsist, it remains then to know if such a decree had not been made, not with relation to the omission of Ceremonies, but rather upon a false persuasion of certain facts which were deliver'd to her as true, tho' indeed they were in themselves very false. For, as the Church, by the general consent of all Divines, is by no means infallible, at least in facts of this kind, a decision founded upon such a persuasion would always be liable to a repeal, and it would be always time to discover the weakness and injustice of it. But we are not in that condition : The Church has not made the decree, and the modern practice of *Rome* cannot pass for such. It is not upon such a practice that one ought to alter Rules : But, on the contrary, it is to these Rules the practice ought to be brought, to be compar'd with, and to be reform'd by them. Hitherto nothing obliges us to think otherwise of the *English* Ordinations, than of those of other Hereticks and Schismatics, which are suffer'd to subsist. And since the Principles of the Church, and of the Schools, equally agree the one with the other about the business of re-ordinations, and that in the whole the essence of Ordination is found, one would be in the wrong, as it appears, to have a different judgment of them.

## CHAP. XV.

*A continuation of the same Subject : 'How much the Church has varied with respect to Re-ordinations. Reflections upon a Principle propos'd by Mr. Thorndike to fix these variations, and to regulate this matter. It is not upon this Principle that the Church hitherto has regulated her conduct on this head.*

**I**F the Principles upon the matter of re-ordinations, which are now unanimously receiv'd in the Church and in the Schools, could have been always adopted as the Rules that ought to be follow'd, we should not have seen so many disputes, and so many scandals caus'd by unlawful re-ordinations, as have happen'd, especially in the middle age. But it must be own'd, that these Principles have had their times and their vicissitudes, as most things in life; and one cannot chuse, upon a view of these variations, but to own the justice of that reflection of Mr. *Pascal's*; "A climate determines what is truth, or a few years of possession. Fundamental Laws change. Right has its periods. Comical sort of Justice, that is bounded by a River or a Mountain! Truth on the other side the *Pyrenees*, Error on this!"

However this would be much less surprising, if this question were only look'd upon as a question of discipline, as some have done in treating of the reiteration of Baptism; and as it seems in short very natural to do. But however, our business here is only to

<sup>d</sup> Un meridiem décide de la verité, ou peu d'années de possession. Les Loix fondamentales changent. Le droit a ses époques. Plaisante justice, qu'une riviere ou une montagne borne! Verité au deçà des *Pyrenées*, erreur au dela! Pensées de *Paschal*, ch. 25. n. 5.

shew that the Principles upon which the not reiterating Sacraments are founded, were not always admitted with the same unanimity as they are at this day.

These Principles properly reduce themselves to two: For the other three do not directly relate to this question, and may subsist with a reiteration. These two Principles are, First, That the administering a Sacrament out of the Church does not make that Sacrament null. Secondly, That we must reason about Ordination as we do about Baptism. Now these two Maxims have been much disputed, and the History of divers Events upon the subject of divers Ordinations will prove it, as it is easy to shew.

1. It was not always agreed upon, that, the administering a Sacrament out of the Church, did not render that Sacrament null. On the contrary, all the reasons of St. Cyprian, and the Churches of Africa, were founded upon this Principle, that out of the Church there was no true Sacrament. Men, says Cyprian, do not become Christians but by Baptism; and Baptism, not having fruitfulness nor holiness but in the Church, how can a Man have God for his Father, who has not also the Church for his Mother? *e Cùm nativitas Christianorum in Baptismo sit, Baptismi autem generatio & sanctificatio apud solam sponsam Christi sit—qui filius Ecclesie non est, quomodo habere possit Deum Patrem, ante Ecclesiam matrem?* There is but one God, says the same Father, one Christ, one Hope, one Faith, one Church, one Baptism; and this Baptism is no where found but in the Church. *f Traditum est nobis quòd sit unus Deus, & Christus unus, & una spes, & fides una, & una Ecclesia, & Baptisma unum, non nisi in una Ecclesia constitutum.*

In his Letters to Jubaian, Firmilian, and others; the same Saint repeats every where the same Principle, and shews that nothing is conferr'd out of the Church: For that out of the Church there is no

*e* Cypr. Ep. 74. ad Pompeium.

*f* Ibid.



right nor power preserv'd to grant any thing that belongs to the Church. *Hæretici foris posui, & extra Ecclesiam constituti, vindicant sibi rem nec sui juris, nec suæ potestatis, cùm Baptismum conferunt: At nos nec ratum possumus nec legitimum judicare, quod apud eos constat illicitum.* This opinion was common to him, and to the whole Church of *Africa*, as appears by the Council of *Carthage*, which he caus'd to be held upon this subject.

There is no true Baptism but in the Church, says *Felix Bishop of Misgirpa. Non est Baptisma nisi in Ecclesia unum & verum,—Nam quæ foris exercentur, nullum habent salutis effectum.* The Church and Heresy are two opposite things. If the Baptism is with us, it cannot be with the Hereticks; and so on the contrary, says *Januarius of Muzuli. Ecclesiæ & hæresis duæ & diversæ res sunt; si hæretici Baptisma habent, nos non habemus: Si autem nos habemus, hæretici habere non possunt.* Either the Church is the Church, or Heresy is the Church: But if Heresy is not the Church, how can Church-Baptism be found among the Hereticks? says *Pelagianus of Luperciana: aut Ecclesia Ecclesia est, aut Hæresis Ecclesia est. Porro si Hæresis Ecclesia non est, quomodo esse apud Hæreticos Baptisma Ecclesiæ potest?* It is visible by all these reasonings, that the Principle at this day receiv'd is, even that so much contested; not only by the *Africans*, which is not at all surprizing, but also by the greatest part of the *Orientals*, even after the Council of *Nice*.

I do not here speak of *Firmilian*, whose Principles every body knows. But *St. Athanasius*, *St. Cyril of Jerusalem*, *St. Basil*, and some others, look'd upon this Principle as very dubious, being perswaded that a Sacrament administred in Heresy was no Sacrament. *Soli Hæretici rebaptizantur*, says *St. Cyril, & si quidem prius illud non erat Baptisma.* This is also the opinion of *St. Basil*, whatever some Divines have thought, *visum est ergo antiquis*, says he in his Letter

## of the English ORDINATIONS. 285

to *Amphilocus*, <sup>h</sup> *hæreticos quidem omnino rejicere—non enim sunt baptizati, qui non in ea quæ nobis sunt tradita baptizati sunt. Quare etiam si hoc magnum Dionysium latuerit, nobis tamen non est servanda erroris imitatio.*

But if they talk'd thus of Baptism, I leave it to every body to think what they judg'd of Ordination conferr'd in Heresy. For, as we have before declar'd in the preceding Chapter, even those who allow'd the Baptism of Hereticks, did not for that reason receive their Ordination. *Innocent the first* is plainly of that opinion, whatever pains have been taken to give him another meaning: For he says positively in one of his Letters, that he receiv'd nothing but their Baptism: <sup>i</sup> *Solum Baptisma ratum esse permitimus.* I know it is pretended, that *Innocent the first* speaks only of the exercise of Orders, which was suspended in those who return'd to the Church. But certainly, the reasonings of this Pope cannot be thus restrain'd, without offering them too much violence. <sup>k</sup> *At dicitur*, says this Prelate, *vera ac justa legitimi sacerdotis benedictio aufert omne vitium, quod à vitioso fuerat injectum. Ergo si ita est*, answers he, *applicentur ad Ordinationem sacrilegi, adulteri, atque omnium criminum rei; quia benedictione Ordinationis crimina vel vitia putantur auferri. Nullus sit pœnitentiae locus, quia id præstare potest Ordinatio, quod longa satisfactio præstare consuevit.* It is certain that this passage cannot be interpreted but of re-ordination, since these Hereticks could not be purified but by the same Sacrament that purified the adulterers and the sacrilegious: Now this Sacrament, according to *Innocent*, is no other than Ordination; *quia benedictione ordinationis crimina vel vitia putantur auferri.* And besides this, what reasonable sense can one give to these words? That those that had nothing could give nothing; *Nihil in dante erat, quod ille posset accipere*, if not that Ordination imprinted no Character upon him who had receiv'd it, and that they attributed to themselves an authority

<sup>h</sup> Ep. 1. ad Amphil.

<sup>i</sup> Innocent. 1, Ep. 18.

<sup>k</sup> Ib. Ep. 22.

which they had not: *Rei sunt usurpata dignitatis, qui conficiendorum Sacramentorum sibi vindicaverunt auctoritatem.*

The second Council of *Saragossa* held in the year 592, is more full to the same purpose. It is upon the business of the *Arians*, whose Baptism it ratifies, but orders their Ordination to be reiterated. <sup>1</sup> *Placuit S. & venerabili Synodo*, says this Council, *ut Presbyteri qui ex hæresi Arianâ ad S. Catholicam Ecclesiam conversi sunt, qui sanctam & puram fidem, atque castissimam tenuerint vitam, acceptâ denuò benedictione Presbyterii, sancte & pure ministrare debeant.* It is certain, that this benediction can here be no other than Ordination; for the imposition of Hands either in Penance or Confirmation, was never call'd by this name *Presbyterii Benedictio*. The Council of *Rome* held about the business of *Constantine*, and that of *Soissons* assembled in the affair of *Ebbon*, reason upon the same Principle, and make the same difference between these two Sacraments.

We have in the oriental Law two answers which confirm the difference which the antients made between Baptism and Ordination given in Heresy. The first is of a Patriarch of *Constantinople*, consulted by *Martyrius* Patriarch of *Antioch* upon the validity of Ordination; For speaking of heretical Clerks, whose Baptism he admitted of, he says, <sup>m</sup> *Secundum hac tanquam egregii laici ad eum gradum ordinantur, in quo prius apud suos erant: Sive Presbyteri, sive Diaconi, &c.* The other is an answer of *Balsamon's*, who was consulted with by a Patriarch of *Alexandria*, <sup>n</sup> *An sacerdos vel diaconus hæreticus dignus habitus divino & sancto Baptismate, vel per sanctum Chrisma sanctificatus, possit facere cum priore ordinatione suâ? An verò si sacra ministrare vellet, iterabitur ejus ordinatio.* He answers precisely in these terms, that the Baptism may be repeated in case the first was null; that he may be receiv'd by Chrism, supposing the former Baptism va-

<sup>1</sup> Can. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Lib. 4. Jur. Orient. p. 290.

<sup>n</sup> Ib. Lib. 5.



lid. ° “ If he be, says he, thought worthy not only of the Priesthood, but also of the Episcopate, his first Priesthood being accounted as sacrilegious, and as not conferr’d, let him rise altogether by the usual degrees to the doctoral dignity:” That is to say, the episcopal dignity. Now it is evident by the two answers reported by *Morinus*, that the eastern, as well as the western Churches made a wide difference between Baptism and Ordination, and that they did not conclude of the validity of the one from that of the other, as it is now done.

We have already seen that *Urban the second* has also acknowledg’d this difference, in avowing that one ought not to reason alike of other Sacraments as of Baptism. <sup>q</sup> *Quia alia in Baptismo, & alia in reliquis Sacramentis consideratio est; quippe cum & Ordine prior & necessarius sit.* This also was the opinion of several Divines in the time of Cardinal *Peter Damian*, as it appears by one of his Treatises, where he plainly observes, that according to them, the Ordinations of the *Arians* ought not to be receiv’d as valid, tho’ their Baptism be admitted of. <sup>r</sup> *Ubi notandum*, says he, *quanta invocationi divini nominis reverentia debeat, cum & ab eis baptizati, quos tam perfida, ut ita dixerim, fides damnat, rebaptizari tamen non audeant.* And nevertheless, speaking of Ordination conferr’d by these Hereticks, he adds, <sup>f</sup> *Quia igitur virtutem S. Spiritus in fide non habent, quâ videlicet omnis Ecclesiæ dignitatis ordo perficitur, apud eos facta Ordinatio canonicis sanctionibus irrita judicabitur.* It is true, he is not of this opinion himself; and notwithstanding what *Morinus* says, he clearly lays it down in the thirtieth and thirty first Chapters of this Treatise, that one

° Si dignus censeatur non modò sacerdotalis dignitatis, sed etiam Episcopalis, priore sacerdotio pro sacrilegio habito, & pro non facto, omninò per consuetos gradus ad doctoriam sublimitatem ascendet. <sup>p</sup> De sac. ordin. p. 98. <sup>q</sup> Ep. ad

Lucium. <sup>r</sup> Petr. Dam. Opusc. 6. c. 22. <sup>f</sup> De sac. ord.

pt. 3. ex. 5. c. 2.

ought

## 288 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

ought to hold the same opinion of Baptism and of Ordination, as it appears by the mere Titles of these two Chapters. <sup>r</sup> *That re-baptizing and re-ordaining is equally a Crime. That as no person ought to be re-baptized, so no one ought to be re-ordain'd.* But the result however of this Treatise is, that all people did not reason after the same manner upon this subject; and this is precisely the whole which we have here propos'd to prove.

But a recital of the facts and the examples which is found in the History of the Church upon this subject, affords yet better proof how much they have varied about this matter, and the words of ancient Authors, which are strict enough. It is true, that bad examples never ought to stand for a rule; *Nunquam à malis sumendum est exemplum*, as *Auxilius* says: So we do not pretend to make a Law of these examples, but only to draw a convincing proof of the difference that there was upon the subj. & of re-ordinations.

I mention not here the *Eighth* Canon of the Council of *Nice*; as it is somewhat obscure, it cannot be brought in as a proof: And tho' it appears to me, interpreted reasonably, to authorize re-ordinations; yet I cannot insist upon a testimony, whereof one knows not in other respects the manner of the execution. Nevertheless, it appears that the *Greeks* had always a propensity to the opinion of re-ordination, and the sole example of the Ordinations of *Maximus* the *Cynic* declar'd null by the first Council of *Constantinople*, seems to decide it: For *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* do not scruple to interpret the decree of that Council in this sense. " " Therefore this holy Synod depos'd *Maximus*, defining that he neither " was, nor had been a Bishop; because he was elected " impiously, and against the Laws, nor that those

<sup>r</sup> Quòd rebaptizatio & reconfecratio par crimen est: Quòd sicut rebaptizari, ita & denuo consecrari quisque non potest.  
<sup>u</sup> Hæc ergo sancta Synodus eum (*Maximum*) abdicavit, definiens nec ipsum esse vel fuisse Episcopum, eò quòd nefarie & contra leges electus sit; nec eos qui ab ipso ordinati.

" whom

“whom he had ordain’d, to what degree soever, “were Clergymen.” But to come to the words of the Canon, <sup>x</sup> which, according to the antient version is thus, *Omnibus scilicet quæ circa eum vel ab eo gesta sunt, in irritum revocatis.*

The example of *Photius*, and of his Ordinations, is much the same with that of *Maximus*. It is for this that *Adrian* the second would treat him in the same manner: And *Anastasius* the Librarian, after *Adrian*, gives a convincing reason, which is, that the Ordination both of the one and the other is very near the same. *Quia Photius Maximo, & ordinatio ejus— istius Ordinationi pene in cunctis videtur esse simillima: Sciendum est, says Anastasius, quia Photius tanquam neophytus & adulter, qui scilicet Ecclesiam viventis invaserit, nunquam fuisse Episcopus dictus & promulgatus est: Sed nec ii qui ab eo manus impositionem acceperunt: Comparati videlicet Maximo Cynico, & ordinatis ab eo a secunda Synodo cum ordinatore repulsis.* It appears that the *Latins*, in effect, transacted with *Photius*, as if he had no character conferr’d upon him. For its certain that they consecrated Churches which he had before consecrated; that they confirm’d them, whom he had before confirm’d; and that *Photius*, by way of reprisal for what was done to him, re-ordain’d those which had been ordain’d by *Ignatius*: *Consecratos ab Ignatio reconsecrare & reordinare conatur, says Nicetas; which proves that he had also re-ordain’d them who had been ordain’d by Photius: That this was in consequence of the decrees of Nicolas the first, who, in his Letter to the Emperor Michael, declares that Gregory of Syracuse could ordain no body: Elifus quemquam ordinare nequivit: That his Prayer could not be heard, and consequently that he had conferr’d no Character. Si non audibilis, ergo inefficax: Si inefficax, profecto Photio nihil prastans: That Photius not having any Character, could give nothing, as Adrian the second*

<sup>x</sup> Can. 4.



says; *Nihil habuit, nihil dedit, nisi forte damnationem habuit, quam sequentibus propinaverit.* And that it is for this reason that one ought not to regard as Clergymen, or as Bishops, those whom *Photius* had ordain'd. *Quos idem Photius in gradu quolibet ordinasse putatus est, ab Episcoporum numero & dignitate, quam usurpativè ac fictè dedit, meritò sequestrantes.* This comes up to the sense of the fourth Canon of the eighth Council, which abolishes all that *Photius* had done: *Omnibus, maximè quæ in ipso & ab ipso ad sacerdotalis gradus acceptionem vel damnationem acta sunt, in irritum ductis.*

It is true, that one may suspect all these as aggravating expressions, and imagine that they only regard a suspension of acting in those who had been ordain'd; and that this is so much the more probable, because in the reconciliation which *Photius* made with the Church of *Rome*, under the Popedom of *John the eighth*, there is no mention made either of re-ordaining *Photius*, or of those who had been ordain'd by him: *In Pontificali officio Comministrum, atque in Pastoralis magisterio Consacerdotem pro Ecclesiæ pace & utilitate recipimus.* This in effect is positive. But, does it not seem suspicious, that in the business of *Photius* there happen'd the same thing which afterwards befell that of *Formosus*, where his Ordinations were one time reputed null, and afterwards valid? For how otherwise can we reconcile *John the eighth*, and *Adrian the second*, who make an essential difference between those who had been ordain'd by *Photius*, and those who after their Ordination adher'd to his Party? *Eos in suis gradibus confirmantes*, says he, speaking of these here, *ignoscendum decrevimus.* Instead of this, he absolutely rejected the others, as having receiv'd nothing but their own condemnation, as we have seen. This is a new proof, that as yet they had no fix'd Principle whereby to judge of the validity or the invalidity of Ordinations.

This

This variation, or, at least, this incertitude, is yet infinitely more visible in the facts relating to *Constantine*, to *Ebbo* and to *Formosus*. One knows not how to deny, with any appearance of truth, that there was not, upon these occasions, actual re-ordinations; and to force every thing to make it applicable to the present practice, is to make the clearest passages of no use to convince us of any truth. It is visible on the one side, that in the affair of *Constantine*, *Stephen* the fourth caus'd a Synod to be held at *Rome*, where it was determin'd that the Bishops, the Priests, and the Deacons ordain'd by this intruder, should be reduc'd to their former degree, and after a new election to be consecrated again. <sup>y</sup> *In eodem Concilio*, says *Anastasius*, *promulgatum est, ut Episcopi illi quos ipse Constantinus consecravit, in pristinum honoris sui gradum reverterentur; & si placabiles fuissent coram populo civitatis suæ, denuo facto decreto, electionis more solito cum Clero & plebe ad Apostolicam advenirent sedem, & ab eodem S. S. Stephano Papa benedictionis susciperent consecrationem; Presbyteri verò illi ac Diaconi ab eodem Constantino consecrati, simili modo in eo quo prius existebant habitu reverterentur, & postmodum si qui eorum placabiles extitissent, antefatus Beatissimus Pontifex Presbyteros eos aut Diaconos consecraret— Ita enim in eodem Concilio statutum est, ut omnia quæ idem Constantinus in ecclesiasticis Sacramentis ac divino cultu egit, iteranda essent, præter sacrum Baptisma, atque sanctum Chrisma.*

The same thing happen'd with regard to *Ebbo*. The second Council of *Soissons* abolish'd all his Ordinations, and declar'd them null without hesitation.

<sup>z</sup> *Decretum est à sacratissima Synodo, ut quidquid in Ordinationibus ecclesiasticis idem Ebbo post damnationem suam egerit, secundum traditionem Apostolicæ sedis, ut in gestis Pontificum legitur, præter sacrum Baptisma, quod in nomine sanctæ Trinitatis perfectum est, irritum & nullum habeatur.*

As to the fact of *Formosus* it is plain, as has been already seen, that nothing can be said to it, but this

<sup>y</sup> *Anast. in Steph. 4.*

<sup>z</sup> *Conc. Suess. act. 5.*

only objection, that all was done contrary to Rule. I agree to it : But after all, if re-ordinations had been regarded as a thing so contrary to the nature of Order, as re-baptization is to the nature of Baptism, it would never have enter'd into the heads of *Stephen the fourth*, and *Sergius the third*, to cause all those to be re-ordain'd, who had been ordain'd by *Formosus*, any more than it did to cause those to be re-baptiz'd whom he had baptized : Even when it is said that all this was done contrary to the Laws ; this is not to say that re-ordinations in general are made contrary to the Laws ; but barely that in this case of *Formosus*, there was no reason to re-ordain those whom he had ordain'd, and that this was the effect of Passion in *Stephen* against this Pope, which is nothing to the question.

It ought therefore to be taken for granted, not only that there has been a disagreement upon the subject of re-ordinations, but also that the Principles now built upon, to establish the validity of Ordinations conferr'd by Hereticks, have not always been regarded as certain ; and that on the contrary, they have for a long time been very much disputed.

A learned *English Divine*, *Herbert Thorndike* by Name, in a Book intitled *De Ratione & Jure Finiendi Controversias Ecclesiæ*, has propos'd a Principle which he believ'd might serve to fix the variations here mention'd, and likewise to regulate this point. I shall transcribe the passage, tho' it be somewhat long, because it is too important to be abridg'd ; and that it very well deserves some reflections upon it.

<sup>a</sup> *In Ordinatione*, says he, *cum duo esse ex dictis constet, auctoritatem ac jus Ecclesiæ, in ordinante primum ; tum consecrationis solemnitatem, quæ Ministerio ordinis traditi auctorem Ecclesiam palam inscribit ; tanto majoris est momenti Ecclesiæ auctoritas quàm consecrandi ritus, ut in irritum cadet ritè ac more Ecclesiæ peracta consecratio,*

<sup>a</sup> De Jure Fin. Controv. cap. 20. p. 363, 365, 367.



ad quam usurpata sit auctoritas Ecclesiæ. Nam etsi in perpetuum Deo sacrum sit, quod semel Deo ritè sacratum fuerit; non tamen Deo ritè sacratum videri debet, quod non sit Jure Ecclesiæ Deo consecratum, etsi servato ritu Ecclesiæ—Itaque si dubium existat de auctoritate Ecclesiæ, non de ritu ordinandi, non est mirum, accedente auctoritate Ecclesiæ, valere Ordinationem non jure factam, ad id ad quod valere eam vult accedens auctoritas Ecclesiæ. Pauca sunt hujus causæ exempla in rebus veteris Ecclesiæ; pauca quidem, sed sunt tamen quæ eam dubiam esse non sinant—Sanè cum nihil majus quæri in hac tota re possit, quàm ut rata sint apud Deum, quæ fidei plebi ministrantur, ab iis quorum dubia sit Ordinatio; nec plebis esse de rebus Ecclesiæ communibus judicium, dictum sit; statuendum est non posse fidelibus fraudi esse ea apud Deum in quibus sequuntur fidem Ecclesiæ—Igitur non est mirum, accedente Ecclesiæ auctoritate, ratas Ordinationes evadere eas, quæ non accedente Ecclesiæ auctoritate irritæ sunt.

\* 1. The Author supposes, with St. Leo, that two things are necessary for a valid Ordination: The solemnity of the Rite prescrib'd by Christ, or for want of such appointment, by the Church; and the authority of the Church; *auctoritatem ac jus Ecclesiæ, tum consecrationis solemnitatem.* And this Article ought not to appear extraordinary since that, in effect, it cannot be imagin'd that a Sacrament conferr'd in Heresy is valid, but for this reason; that it is suppos'd that what is done in Heresy, is in consequence of the power of the Church, which an error does not suspend. But if the profession of an error cannot suspend the power of the Church, the Church herself cannot put a stop to her proper power, and refuse to acknowledge for her own operation what was perform'd out of her Bosom. The Author asserts it, and I know not how it can be disputed with him.

2. If, according to Thorndike, these two things are equally necessary, as it is certain that the omission of

\* The remaining part of this Chapter considerably varies from the French Edition, being alter'd by the learned Author.

the Rite destroys the Sacrament, the defect of the authority of the Church ought, by a necessary consequence, to produce the same effect. And this may easily be comprehended, by a comparison of it with Marriage, where the matter and form would be in vain made use of, if the Laws of the Church and State are violated, since by a defect of authority it is null 'by the consent of all our Divines: *Non Deo sacramentum ritè videri debet, quod non sit jure Ecclesiæ Deo sacramentum, etsi servato ritu Ecclesiæ.*

3. He says that it is easy to be conceiv'd how an Ordination that was invalid, may afterwards become valid, without any thing new intervening: For the essential Rite having been administered, the Church, which at first in refusing her consent, hinders this Sacrament from having its effect, but afterwards, taking away this incapacity, by her consent, she reintegrates what what at first was done; and that nothing more is wanting to render the Sacrament valid. *Itaque si dubium existat de auctoritate Ecclesiæ, non de ritu ordinandi, non est mirum accedente auctoritate Ecclesiæ valere Ordinationem non jure factam, ad id ad quod valere eam vult accedens auctoritas Ecclesiæ.*

4. This Maxim, according to this Author, should be very proper to reconcile all the opposite facts before related. For, says he, admitting for a Principle, that the authority of the Church is as essential to the validity of a Sacrament as the use of the matter and form, it ought not to appear surprising, that some Ordinations have not been judg'd valid, and that the Church has receiv'd others: The Church having been pleas'd to condescend to recognize these, and not to admit the rest, either upon the account of severity or prudence. *Non est mirum accedente Ecclesiæ auctoritate, ratas Ordinationes evadere eas, quæ non accedente auctoritate Ecclesiæ irritæ erant.* On the contrary, if this Principle be not admitted, the reconciling these facts is impossible. *Conciliandorum sibi invicem Ecclesiæ*

*sic decretorum & gestorum rationem inibimus frustra, hac repudiata quærendam.*

5. It is true, it does not appear that, in the affair of Baptism, the Hereticks reason'd upon this Principle; but then, as it is shewn before, the anti-ents have not always argu'd the same way as to these two Sacraments. <sup>b</sup> *I know, says he, that it was otherwise determin'd as to the Baptism of Hereticks; but this is not to be extended to Ordination, neither is it necessary to allow their confirmation valid, whose Baptism is such; much less their Ordination.* And it appears in effect, that St. Leo, in his Letter to Rusticus of Narbon, left the validity of Ordination to the good pleasure and authority of the Church. <sup>c</sup> *Si autem Clerici, says this great Pope, ab ipsis pseudo-episcopis in eis Ecclesiis ordinati sunt, qui ad proprios Episcopos pertinebant, & Ordinatione eorum consensu, & judicio presidentium facta est, potest rata haberi, ita ut ipsis Ecclesiis perseverent. Aliter autem vana habenda est creatio, quæ nec loco fundata est, nec auctore munita.*

6. This Author even pretends, that this Principle alone is sufficient to remove all ambiguity from equivocal Ordinations; and that the people in following it, are under no necessity to enter into a troublesome inquiry about the validity or invalidity of Ordinations, since they cannot err in abandoning themselves to the the Judgment of the Church upon this matter, and since her declaration will determine all their doubts. *Statuendum est non posse fidelibus fraudi esse ea apud Deum, in quibus sequuntur fidem Ecclesiæ.*

This is precisely the Author's system, the solidity of which I leave to the readers Judgment. That which is most certain is, that if it appears not altogether unreasonable, and that if it has some advanta-

<sup>b</sup> Scio aliter decretum esse de Baptismo hæreticorum— sed hoc ad ordinationem trahendum non est— nec est necesse ratam hæreticorum confirmationem concedere, quorum ratus sit Baptismus, multo minus ordinationem. Thorndike, ubi supr.

<sup>c</sup> Leo. M. Ep. 2.



ges, it has yet more inconveniencies, and is absolutely destroy'd by the facts and the practice of the Church; and which never can serve to explain the difficulty in debate: For, if those who have disputed the validity of some Sacraments seem to suppose it, the Arguments of those who have oppos'd re-ordinations, and who have at last prevail'd in the Church, have always suppos'd the contrary. So that the result of this affair is, that there has been little uniformity in the Church as to this matter; and that, if the Principle receiv'd at this time in the catholick Schools takes place, we cannot dispute with the *English* the validity of their Ordination.

---

#### CHAP. XVI.

*The succession of the English Bishops has not been interrupted by the Schism.*

**T**HIS proposition is a consequence of all the rest, and the natural conclusion of this Treatise. It is not necessary, before the truth is establish'd, to repeat what I before frequently observ'd: That I do not undertake to prove that these Bishops are lawful Bishops, that they still preserve their jurisdiction, and that they lawfully perform the functions annex'd to their Dignity and Character. I have explain'd myself in terms so clear, and so express upon this head, so that a sentiment cannot be imputed to me without injustice, which I disavow, and which does not necessarily follow from any Principles which I have laid down. This proposition therefore confines itself to prove that the Bishops, who since the Schism, have hitherto successively fill'd the *English* Bishopricks, are true Bishops; and that they want nothing to become lawful Bishops, but to be united to the Catholick Church.

This

of the English ORDINATIONS. 297

This *Thesis* confin'd to these terms, is a necessary consequence of the Principles and Facts laid down in this Dissertation. For if on the one side, there has been nothing wanting in the matter and form us'd in the Ordination of the *English* Bishops; and if, on the other, those, who administred this Sacrament were themselves validly consecrated, it necessarily follows, that notwithstanding the disturbances which happen'd in that Church, and the novelties which they introduc'd into the Rite of Ordination, the *English* Bishops are true Bishops, and that they want nothing with regard to their Character. This consequence is so certain, that it is not disputed by any of those who acknowledge for valid the Ordinations perform'd by *Edward the sixth's* Ordinal. And if *Sanders, Harding, Stapleton*, and other Divines would never own for Bishops those who had been ordain'd under Queen *Elizabeth*, it is because their Ordination appear'd to them null, and the succession consequently interrupted.

Such in effect was the pretension of the greatest number of the catholick Divines, in the time of Queen *Elizabeth*: But upon what was it founded? This is what they do not explain to us, at least, to those who do not satisfy themselves with declamations instead of reasons, with whom invectives, and angry prejudices do not take place of solid proofs and convincing demonstrations. And to be convinc'd of this, a Man need only reflect that the Fable of the *Nagshhead* had not as yet its birth, and that the validity of the Ordinations of these Bishops was not disputed, but upon an opinion, at present abandon'd, of the necessity of the delivery of the Instruments as the matter, and of the Prayers that accompany it as the form; and upon the omission of all the Ceremonies prescrib'd by the *Roman* Pontifical. Now a pretension that has no other foundation, is evidently weak and indefensible, since it is now unanimously agreed, that all this is but accidental to Ordination, and

and that imposition of Hands is the only thing that may now be reputed essential.

This opinion therefore of the *English* Divines does no way embarrass the validity of the *English* Ordinations; and, consequently, casts no blemish upon the succession of the Bishops of that Church. But to shew this more at large, we may observe four different periods of time, where the succession may have been interrupted; namely, under *Henry* the eighth, under *Edward* the sixth, under *Queen Elizabeth*, and under *Cromwell*. Nevertheless, there is none of these periods upon which one can fix the interruption of the succession of the Bishops; the proof is easy, after the facts which have been before insisted upon.

In short, to begin with the reign of *Henry* the eighth. There is not one person who dares maintain, that in that reign the succession has been interrupted; since by the consent, even of the Divines who are the most opposite to that Church, all the Rites of Ordination were conserv'd; that they retain'd the Unctions, and the other Ceremonies, and that all then was practis'd with so much exactness, that in the reign of *Queen Mary*, to establish things upon their former foot, they only repealed what was done since the latter end of the reign of *Henry* the eighth. *Ceremoniam & solemnem unctionem, more Ecclesiastico adhuc in consecratione illâ adhiberi voluit Henricus VIII.* says *Sanders*,<sup>d</sup> who, observing the change made under *King Edward*, again repeats, that under *Henry* all the Priests and Bishops were ordain'd after a catholick manner. <sup>e</sup> *Primo loco sancierunt ut cum Episcopi ac Presbyteri Anglicani, ritu fere catholico (exceptâ Romani Pontificis obedientiâ, quam omnes abnegabant) ad illud usque tempus ordinati fuissent, in postremum aliâ omnino formâ ab ipsis præscriptâ ordinationes fierent.* It ought therefore to pass for certain, that all the Bishops, and consequently that Episcopacy subsisted intire, and

<sup>d</sup> *Sanders de Schismate Anglicano* l. 3. p. 348. lib. 2. p. 243.

<sup>e</sup> *Ibid.*



without interruption in the reign of *Henry the eighth*, notwithstanding the Schism which took its rise under that Prince; and that he did nothing but support himself to the end of his reign; for there were a great number of Bishops consecrated after the Schism: *Cranmer's Register* has preserv'd several for us; among others, *Rowland Lee* Bishop of *Coventry*, *George Brown* Archbishop of *Dublin*, *Robert Warton* Bishop of *St. Asaph*, *Robert Holgat* Bishop of *Landaff*, *Thomas Thirlby* Bishop of *Westminster*, *John Wakeman* Bishop of *Gloucester*, *John Skip* Bishop of *Hereford*, *Arthur Buckley* Bishop of *Bangor*, *Paul Bush* Bishop of *Bristol*, *Anthony Kitchin* Bishop of *Landaff*, &c. All these Bishops were consecrated after the Schism, and ordain'd intirely according to the Rite of the *Roman Pontifical*, excepting the Oath made to the Pope. The *Romans* themselves have acknowledg'd these Bishops to be ordain'd validly: For in the time of the re-union, in the reign of *Queen Mary*, several were continu'd in their Sees without its being thought necessary to reiterate their Ordination, as *Robert Warton*, *George Day*, *Anthony Kitchin*, *Thirlby* Bishop of *Westminster*, &c. It is therefore evident that to that time the succession of Bishops had not been interrupted in *England*, and that notwithstanding the Schism, Episcopacy was not destroy'd.

The second period causes a little more difficulty: It is that of *Edward the sixth*. It was under that Prince that the form of Ordination was chang'd; and *Cranmer*, who had a great Hand in that alteration, was the first who authoriz'd it by his <sup>f</sup> example, in the ordination which he made of *John Poynt*, as Bishop of *Rocheſter*, the twenty ninth of *June*, 1550. There was afterwards no other form usd in all that reign; and the Parliament made a Statute to abolish the Book of Ordinations which was us'd before *King Edward's* reign. They continu'd however in the mean time to ordain Bishops; they preserv'd the imposi-

<sup>f</sup> *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, p. 192.

tion of Hands and Prayer ; they retain'd even, according to *Sanders*, the antient number of Bishops prescrib'd by the Canons for consecrating the new Bishops. & *Servata semper priori, de numero presentium Episcoporum qui manus ordinando imponerent, lege.* The difficulty which we can make as to this period therefore, can arise only from the change made in the Rite of Ordination. But this is a weak difficulty, and it even merits not our attention, after all that has been prov'd throughout this Dissertation.

I shall content my self with making two remarks, which are sufficient to put the thing out of dispute. First, that the Ordination of the new Bishops is alone capable to assure the succession. The Second, which ought to be yet more decisive, according to the Principles of those whom I have to deal with, is, that even under *Edward*, the antient Episcopacy subsisted, and always prevail'd during that reign. I begin the proof with this last.

*England* has in all 26 Episcopal Sees ; and during the whole reign of *Edward* the sixth, there were but six Bishops ordain'd according to the new Ordinal, to fill some of these Sees which were vacant either by death or deposition. In short, the new Ordinal did not last three whole years, since *Poynt*, who was the first ordain'd by it, receiv'd Ordination the twenty ninth of *June* 1550, and *Harley*, who was the last, was ordain'd the twenty sixth of *May* 1553 ; during the interval of these three years, we find but four Bishops ordain'd in *England* by the new Ordinal ; namely, *Hooper* for *Gloucester* the twenty eighth of *March* 1551, *Scory* for *Rocheſter*, and *Coverdale* for *Exeter*, who receiv'd Consecration the thirtieth of *August* 1551 ; and *Taylor* for *Lincoln*, who was ordain'd the twenty sixth of *June* 1552. So that of the 26 Bishops which they have to fill the Sees of that Church, during all the reign of *Edward*, there

were but six ordain'd by the new Ordinal, viz. *Poy-  
net, Hooper, Scory, Coverdale, Taylor, and Harley*, and  
that all the rest as yet retain'd the antient Ordinati-  
on. Is not this demonstrative, that the succession  
subsisted during that reign, and that the new Office  
lasted too short a time to interrupt it, and to change  
the nature of the Episcopacy.

This remark alone appears sufficient to assure the  
succession of Episcopacy in that reign. But I add,  
that even the Ordination of the new Bishops is suf-  
ficient to oblige us to own that Episcopacy subsisted  
under King *Edward*, notwithstanding the change  
made in the form of Ordination. For to confine  
my self here to an argument, which the practice of  
the Church, and the consent of Divines, gives all the  
force to: The catholick Church receives as valid all  
Ordinations perform'd in Schism and Heresy, when  
nothing essential is omitted. Cardinal *Pole* himself  
acknowledg'd it, in the power which he gave to the  
Chapter of *Canterbury* the eighth of *January 1555*,  
to reconcile them who would re-unite themselves to the  
Church. <sup>h</sup> *Quodque irregularitate & aliis præmissis non  
obstantibus, in suis ordinibus etiam ab hæreticis & Schis-  
maticis Episcopis, etiam minus ritè, dummodo in eorum  
collatione ecclesiastica forma & intentio sit servata, per eos  
susceptis—etiam in altaris ministerio ministrare possint.*  
Now, according to another Principle at this day,  
almost universally receiv'd in the Schools, and gene-  
rally by all learned Divines, imposition of Hands and  
Prayer are the only things essential to Ordination; and  
the Ordinal of King *Edward* has preserv'd both the  
one and the other: Therefore Bishops ordain'd by  
this new Ordinal are true Bishops, and this new Or-  
dination is alone sufficient to assure the succession of  
Episcopacy.

I do not see what can be oppos'd to this proof;  
especially, since these new Bishops have been con-  
secrated by others, of whose consecration there was

<sup>h</sup> *Memorials of Cranmer's Appendix, p. 188.*



tion of Hands and Prayer; they retain'd even, according to *Sanders*, the antient number of Bishops prescrib'd by the Canons for consecrating the new Bishops. & *Servata semper priori, de numero presentium Episcoporum qui manus ordinando imponerent, lege.* The difficulty which we can make as to this period therefore, can arise only from the change made in the Rite of Ordination. But this is a weak difficulty, and it even merits not our attention, after all that has been prov'd throughout this Dissertation.

I shall content my self with making two remarks, which are sufficient to put the thing out of dispute. First, that the Ordination of the new Bishops is alone capable to assure the succession. The Second, which ought to be yet more decisive, according to the Principles of those whom I have to deal with, is, that even under *Edward*, the antient Episcopacy subsisted, and always prevail'd during that reign. I begin the proof with this last.

*England* has in all 26 Episcopal Sees; and during the whole reign of *Edward* the sixth, there were but six Bishops ordain'd according to the new Ordinal, to fill some of these Sees which were vacant either by death or deposition. In short, the new Ordinal did not last three whole years, since *Poynet*, who was the first ordain'd by it, receiv'd Ordination the twenty ninth of *June* 1550, and *Harley*, who was the last, was ordain'd the twenty sixth of *May* 1553; during the interval of these three years, we find but four Bishops ordain'd in *England* by the new Ordinal; namely, *Hooper* for *Gloucester* the twenty eighth of *March* 1551, *Scory* for *Rocheſter*, and *Coverdale* for *Exeter*, who receiv'd Consecration the thirtieth of *August* 1551; and *Taylor* for *Lincoln*, who was ordain'd the twenty sixth of *June* 1552. So that of the 26 Bishops which they have to fill the Sees of that Church, during all the reign of *Edward*, there

& *Sanders de Schism. Angl. p. 348.*

were but six ordain'd by the new Ordinal, viz. *Poy-  
net, Hooper, Scory, Coverdale, Taylor, and Harley*, and  
that all the rest as yet retain'd the antient Ordinati-  
on. Is not this demonstrative, that the succession  
subsisted during that reign, and that the new Office  
lasted too short a time to interrupt it, and to change  
the nature of the Episcopacy.

This remark alone appears sufficient to assure the  
succession of Episcopacy in that reign. But I add,  
that even the Ordination of the new Bishops is suf-  
ficient to oblige us to own that Episcopacy subsisted  
under King *Edward*, notwithstanding the change  
made in the form of Ordination. For to confine  
my self here to an argument, which the practice of  
the Church, and the consent of Divines, gives all the  
force to: The catholick Church receives as valid all  
Ordinations perform'd in Schism and Heresy, when  
nothing essential is omitted. Cardinal *Pole* himself  
acknowledg'd it, in the power which he gave to the  
Chapter of *Canterbury* the eighth of *January 1555*,  
to reconcile them who would re-unite themselves to the  
Church. <sup>h</sup> *Quodque irregularitate & aliis præmissis non  
obstantibus, in suis ordinibus etiam ab hæreticis & Schis-  
maticis Episcopis, etiam minus ritè, dummodo in eorum  
collatione ecclesiastica forma & intentio sit servata, per eos  
susceptis—etiam in altaris ministerio ministrare possint.*  
Now, according to another Principle at this day,  
almost universally receiv'd in the Schools, and gene-  
rally by all learned Divines, imposition of Hands and  
Prayer are the only things essential to Ordination; and  
the Ordinal of King *Edward* has preserv'd both the  
one and the other: Therefore Bishops ordain'd by  
this new Ordinal are true Bishops, and this new Or-  
dination is alone sufficient to assure the succession of  
Episcopacy.

I do not see what can be oppos'd to this proof;  
especially, since these new Bishops have been con-  
secrated by others, of whose consecration there was

<sup>h</sup> *Memorials of Cranmer's Appendix*, p. 188.

never any doubt; that some of those who had been employ'd in the like consecrations, as <sup>i</sup> *Robert B. of Carlisle*, who assisted in the consecration of *Harley*, were continued <sup>k</sup> in *Queen Mary's* reign. <sup>l</sup> And that in the sentences of deposition, which that Princess caus'd to be pronounc'd against these Bishops, there is no mention at all of deficiency in the Ordinal or their consecration, but of a defective title as to their Bulls, and upon account of particular Crimes which they are charg'd with. This proves evidently, that they did not doubt of the validity of the new form, and that consequently these new Bishops were qualified to preserve the succession, when the antient Episcopacy was not in being; but as yet it did subsist: And the second period is in every respect out of dispute.

The third period, which is that of the reign of *Queen Elizabeth*, is the most famous of them all; and it is this which is insisted upon with the greatest earnestness; tho' the foundation is as little solid, as that upon which the interruption of the succession in the time of *King Edward* is founded. It is true, that in this reign there were altogether wanting Bishops consecrated by the antient form: For the *Queen*, the first year of her reign, fill'd almost all the Sees of *England*, vacant either by death, or by the deposition of the old Bishops; and excepting *Barlow*, *Kitchin*, and some others, who dy'd a few years afterwards; this Church found herself all at once renew'd, without her having so much as one Bishop consecrated according to the form prescrib'd by the old Pontifical.

This is the main difference found between the times of *Edward* and those of *Elizabeth*: But it is pretended that this is not the only difference. The principal one according to some, is taken from the uncertainty of the consecration of the new Bishops. It is

<sup>i</sup> Ib. p. 301.  
Harmer. p. 113.

<sup>k</sup> Fasti. Eccles. Ang. p. 335.

<sup>l</sup> Ant.



not that they receiv'd no sort of Ordination; but it is alledg'd, that it is very uncertain whether the person from whom they derive it had been himself truly ordain'd; and that the uncertainty of this Ordination, joyn'd to that of the novelty of the Ordinal, which they were consecrated by, casts an essential blemish upon the succession, and will not suffer us to believe that the episcopal Ministry could continue in the Church of *England*. This uncertainty is not found to be equally the same, during the time of *King Edward*, since there were left more than twenty Bishops manifestly ordain'd, and even according to the *Roman Pontifical*. There is therefore, in the opinion of these Divines, nothing to be inferr'd from the times of *King Edward* to those of *Elizabeth*; and when one has demonstrated that the succession was not interrupted in the days of the former, he must prove over again, that it has nothing more of deficiency in the time of *Elizabeth*; that which increases the difficulty, is the alteration of circumstances.

If the uncertainty of *Parker's* consecration were manifest, one must necessarily abandon the defence of the succession. In things of this nature, it is necessary that facts should be certain, to the end that one may draw a sufficient consequence from them.

But here is an important observation to be made: It is, that among those who dispute the succession and validity of Ordinations, there is a great opposition of Sentiments and Principles. Some agree that the new Ordinal of *King Edward* contains all that is essential to render Ordinations valid: But they deny that it was us'd in *Parker's* Ordination, or that the consecrator was a true Bishop; and this opinion is the more common among those, who, tho' they are ignorant of the facts, are best instructed in the study of Divinity. Others own that *Parker* receiv'd an Ordination, but they dispute the validity of the Ordinal, and this was the opinion of the Divines who were *Parker's* cotemporaries. Others agree with

with the former, that the Ordinal was valid, and with the second that *Parker* was ordain'd by it; but they maintain that the consecrator was never consecrated, or at least, that there is no proof that he was; and this is the refuge of those who build only upon a doubt. Others in fine deny the whole, both the validity of the Ordinal, and the Ordination of *Parker* according to it, and pretend that he had no other than a ludicrous Ordination, perform'd in a Tavern, more proper to serve for an interlude in a Comedy, than to establish the succession of a Church. This is the opinion of *Champney* who first brought it in vogue, and which since has had so many defenders. All these opinions refute one another, and it is almost sufficient to establish the disputed succession, to destroy the arguments of some by those of the others, and to judge of their weakness by their contrariety.

Nevertheless, without insisting too long upon their contrariety, there needs no more, but to recollect what has been prov'd in the course of this Dissertation, to shew the insolidity of all these several pretensions.

I. The ridiculousness of the charge, that the Ordination was perform'd in a Tavern, has been demonstrated in the second Chapter; and it is evidently prov'd, that this Fable, invented afterwards, is inconsistent not only with the Record of the Ordination still in being, and which is blemish'd in vain by endeavouring to prove it supposititious, but also with all the other publick Records, as well those at the Rolls, as in the ecclesiastical Repositories, which concern *Parker's* Ordination, and that of all the other Bishops, which moreover must necessarily be suppos'd to be forg'd: A supposition which has not hitherto been so much as attempted to be prov'd. Even independent of this insuperable difficulty, which alone amounts to a demonstration, they have not taken care to give it the appearances of truth: And all the circumstances are so whimsical and so contrary to good sense  
and

and probability, that the bare producing a chimera of this nature is a most convincing refutation, and the only proper one that it deserves.

2. That which is related in the third, fourth and fifth Chapters, not only proves the truth of *Barlow's* Consecration, but even the notoriety of it, even so, that the proofs establish the truth of the fact in such a manner, that they leave no room for so much as a doubt; as it has been shewn in the twelfth Chapter. And as this doubt is now become the last, and in a manner the only refuge of those who dispute the validity of the *English* Ordinations: This uncertainty being taken away, and the notoriety of *Barlow's* Consecration being fully establish'd, there remains nothing more for them to do, who in other respects acknowledge the truth of *Parker's* Consecration, and the validity of the new Ordinal, but to own that there is no more room to deny the succession of Episcopacy, and that the *English* are in the case of the *Donatists* and other Sects, and that their separation has not made them lose either their Ordination or their Character; and that in returning to the unity of the Church they recover all the rights and all the advantages which they have lost by their schism, and which they have fallen away from by their declared adherence to their errors.

3. As to those who dispute the validity of the new Ordinal, they must, who defend an opinion which has no other foundation than the prejudice of school divinity, make it appear either that imposition of hands and prayer do not make the only essential parts of Ordination, or that all the ceremonies fix'd by the long practice of the Church cannot be chang'd without destroying the Sacrament whereof they are a part, tho' these ceremonies have not been practis'd either universally, nor in all times; or that these ceremonies may become essential by some other means than by the determination of the Scripture, or by a tradition equivalent to it, or at least by the consent and practice of



all the Churches in the world: or that in short the alterations made by Hereticks or by Schismatics in the administration of Sacraments, or rather in ceremonies not essential that accompany them, render those Sacraments null and invalid. If all these pretensions are equally indefensible, it is equally indefensible that the new Ordinal introduced by *Edward the Sixth* can invalidate the Ordinations of the new Bishops, and consequently interrupt the succession.

Now it has been proved that all these propositions are contrary to truth, and to all the theological opinions which have hitherto been agreed to, as to what constitutes the nature and the validity of Sacraments; and I dare even affirm with some confidence, that one may even defy those who attack the validity of the new Ordinal to prove that any of these propositions are not only not so much as true, but even that they carry any reasonable degree of probability. This here is not the place to destroy and to refute at large, nor even to repeat what has been urged. It is enough to observe, that from the proofs produced one has a right to conclude that the new Ordinal is valid, and that consequently the succession is certain, because the one evidently follows the other. For if it be agreed that *Parker's* Ordination is good, that Ordination being once proved valid, the chain of the succession is visible, since the new Bishops derive their Ordination from *Parker*, and since he derives his from the ancient Bishops.

4. As for those who acknowledge the validity of the new Ordinal, and who presume to maintain either that *Parker* was not ordained according to it, or that he was ordained by a man not consecrated, they will find themselves beforehand refuted in what they have to say, since this Hypothesis being founded either upon the Fable of the *Nagshhead*, or upon the Non-Consecration of *Barlow*. The overturning these two falsehoods entirely destroys the chimerical pretence of these Authors, and ascertains the Ordination of the

*English*

*English*, and their succession; a commendation which we cannot in justice dispute with them.

This third period has therefore nothing in it contrary to the succession of the Bishops. The two differences made between it and that of King *Edward*, are either not real, or not solid. The uncertainty of *Parker's* Ordination is a chimera, and the conservation of the old Bishops becomes unnecessary, being assur'd that the Ordination of the new Bishops is valid, and consequently sufficient: That episcopacy subsists in the Ministers ordain'd according to the *Roman* pontifical, or in the other ordain'd by a ritual, where what is essential is equally conserv'd; and that it is always the same episcopacy. The succession of doctrine is not conserv'd, if you please; the unity is alter'd, or rather broken by the schism, but the ministry has preserv'd itself; and according to St. *Augustine*, it is the Church that always brings forth, whether it be by the means of *Sarah*, or by that of *Agar*; for even out of the Church one cannot lose the character which *Jesus Christ* has imprinted; and that conserves itself amidst the additions or the castrations which the separation of the Church ordinarily produces.

This period being once justified, there afterwards remains no difficulty; and the interruption that happen'd under *Cromwell*, is too short to have produced any change in the government of that Church. From *Elizabeth* to *Charles the First*, the succession continu'd from time to time by the Ordinations which were made of new Bishops by degrees, as they happen'd to be wanted. The Ordinal prescrib'd by *Edward*, and restored by *Elizabeth*, was exactly observed. The government of that Church was always episcopal until the time of *Cromwell*; who perceiving that the Bishops were much attach'd to the King, and that the Presbyterians were more convenient for the Republican Government which he would establish, he suspend'd the election of new Bishops; and he would have entirely destroyed episcopacy in that Kingdom, if he

had lived long enough to see all the B shops, ordain'd before his elevation, dead before him.

But Tyranny has its determin'd times in the dispositions of Providence. Cromwel went about to destroy all, says the wise Monsieur Pascal<sup>a</sup>, only a little grain of sand placed itself in his Ureter; and this little gravel, which elsewhere had been nothing, fixed in that place, and behold he is dead, his family debased, the King restored. Let us add, and episcopacy alto; since under Charles the Second the Bishops who survived Cromwel presently ordain'd new Bishops, who repaired the succession which that Rebel would have destroyed.

In short, in 1660<sup>b</sup> there still remained at least nine Bishops ordained before the great Rebellion; that is to say, the Bishops of London Bath, Oxford, Rochester, Bangor, Ely, Salisbury, Chichester and Coventry. In this Year almost all the other Sees were fill'd, and several of the new Bishops<sup>c</sup>, as the Bishops of London, Durham, St. Davids, Peterborough, Landaff, Carlisle, Chester, Exeter Salisbury, Worcester, Lin.coln and St. Asaph, were consecrated by some of those who remained, and according to the Ordinal authorized in England ever since Q. Elizabeth's time: so that if the succession subsisted under Elizabeth, it could not have been interrupted in the time of Charles the second; and it is evident, that though the Bishops are fallen, episcopacy is not fallen with them; and that to make it lawful, there needs no more than to renounce their schism and error.

All these facts are evident; and I now see but one reasonable difficulty that can here be objected, which is, that to continue an episcopal succession, there must not only be a valid Ordination, but also a lawful Right in the Bishops that enjoy the episcopal Sees, without

<sup>a</sup> Cromwel alloit tout ravager sans une petit grain de sable qui se mit dans son uretere. Mais se petit gravier, qui n'etoit rien ailleurs, mis en cet endroit, la voila mort, sa famille abaissée, le Roy retabli. Pens. art. 24. p. 127.

<sup>b</sup> Collier's Eccl. Hist. tom. 2. pag. 873.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid.

which



which they are intruders and usurpers. Now, say they, the new *English* Bishops have no right of this kind. 1. Because they were ordained, the greatest part of the true Bishops being alive, and against their consent. 2. Because they have occupied their Sees in virtue of a vicious title, that is to say, in virtue of provisions granted by a lay excommunicated Prince. 3. Because they are themselves notoriously excommunicated and irregular: Therefore this succession cannot be maintained. And supposing even the validity of the Ordination, the *English* have not the least solid argument for their reestablishment.

This here is a mere question about a word, as I have shewn in speaking of the authority of national Churches. I will even suppose, with the authors of the objection, that the succession is not lawfully founded, that it is contrary to law; that the new Bishops intruded into the place of the old, without a lawful authority. This is not exactly the question. When we speak in this matter of a succession, there is nothing properly treated of, but to know whether there be a succession of Bishops validly ordained, who have transmitted the Ordination from hand to hand; and then we cannot dispute the lawful exercise of their Ministry as soon as the Church, by receiving them into her bosom, has corrected what is faulty in their vocation. So that they may be intruders into their Sees, their title may be faulty, they may be themselves excommunicated and irregular; all this makes the calling very unlawful, and the exercise of their functions; but it does not interrupt the succession of valid Ordinations, which preserves the true Priesthood and Episcopacy, notwithstanding the faults and defects which the schism and the heresy may have mingled with it.

Such is the succession which is preserved in the sects which are separated from the Church. When the *Donatists* made a schism, the succession of their Bishops was acknowledg'd, they were nevertheless guilty of the same intrusion which the *English* are reproached

with; they erected Altar against Altar, they put themselves in the place of catholick Bishops, their title was entirely faulty, and they were equally excommunicated and irregular. Nevertheless the catholick Bishops acknowledged in them the validity of the Priesthood, and were far from disputing their succession; they offer'd to give place to them, provided they would by a re-union put an end to the schism. A man cannot refuse the *English* a succession of the same kind, supposing once the validity of their Ordination, which the authors of the objection will easily admit. Their cause is not different, but is even more favourable, because it is not necessary to displace any body in acknowledging them. The variety so little essential, which is found in the Ordinal that they have substituted in the room of the old one, ought not to be disputed about; and the reiteration of Sacraments is so contrary to the spirit of the catholick Church, that one cannot avoid believing, that they would never have carried themselves even at *Rome* as they have done with regard to the *English*, if they had not been prejudiced by the Fable of the *Nagshhead*; which has always been believed true there, as the famous *M. Fontanini* acknowledges in a letter written some time ago to one of my friends.

---

#### CHAP. XVII.

##### *The conclusion and recapitulation of this Treatise.*

**I** DO not believe that I have omitted any thing that could serve to clear the subject which I proposed to examine: I have given even the difficulties all the force they could afford me, because I proposed to my self no other end, than that of knowing the truth; I have no interest but to clear it, so that I was also ready

## *of the English ORDINATIONS.* 311

ready to give way to the force of the objections, as well as to that of the answers. It is the publick that is at present to determine on which side truth is to be found, and to decide, whether there be the least reason to reiterate Ordinations, whose validity does appear, it seems, without any flaw.

For to recapitulate in a few words all that we have set forth in this Work. Reordinations have always been odious in the Church; and to come to this it must appear, either that the nullity be evident, or that the doubt be solid, and founded upon weighty reasons, or upon facts which are impossible to be disputed. Now there is neither an evident nullity, nor a doubt so solid, as to oblige us to reiterate the Ordinations of the *English*.

*Parker* is the source and head of this new ministry; it is upon his Ordination that all the rest depend, and its validity carries along with it that of the Bishops ordain'd since the schism, and consequently the constant succession of the *English* Episcopacy. The validity of his Ordination depends principally upon two things; the person of the Consecrator, and the form of the Consecration.

As to the first; The Consecrator, who is *Barlow*, (for as to the other three who assisted with him in this Consecration there is no dispute) we have proved in the third, fourth and fifth Chapters, that he himself was consecrated in the time of *Henry the Eighth*, and consequently by the *Roman* Pontifical; that though the act of his Consecration is not yet found, one cannot nevertheless doubt but that he was truly consecrated, because this omission is supply'd by positive proofs, by a number of records, which all imply a Consecration; by the general consent of his friends and enemies, his contemporaries, who look'd upon him as a Bishop, and who never reproach'd him with not being such; by the notoriousness of the fact, which could not be concealed from a number of Persons that were interested: in a word, by examples of



omissions of the same nature which were never insisted upon, and by the want of solidity found in the difficulties oppos'd to the truth of this consecration.

It is therefore not on the side of the Consecrator that a nullity can arise in *Parker's* consecration; which in short he never was reproach'd with during his life, that he was consecrated by a man that had not been himself consecrated.

No more can it be as to the form ordain'd by the ritual of *Edward*, since, as it has been seen in the sixth and seventh Chapters, this form differs not as to essentials from that of the *Roman* pontifical: For, in the opinion of all the best Divines, that which is essential to the form of an Ordination is the invocation of the holy Spirit, or Prayer, wherein are desired for the Bishop elect, the lights and graces necessary for the worthy performance of his Ministry. Now this invocation and this prayer is found, though in different terms in King *Edward's* ritual, as well as in the *Roman* pontifical; and by a comparison of the one with the other, it is easy to be convinc'd thereof.

Besides, it has been prov'd in the second Chapter, that this Ordinal in question was us'd in the Ordination of *Parker*; that the ceremony of his consecration perform'd at a Tavern, is an heap of falsehoods ill put together; that the account given of it neither is consistent with it self, nor with the publick registers; that there was neither a necessity nor any advantage in having recourse to such an Ordination; that there neither wanted Bishops nor a place convenient to perform this ceremony; that though several Prelates had refus'd to be concern'd in this affair, there were more than enough left to perform this function; that this fable was not known by the cotemporary writers, the greatest enemies to the new Ordinations, and the most concern'd to decry them; that the menace of excommunication, invented to serve as a support to this fable, has not even the probability necessary to cover a falsehood: In a word, the more one examines into

*of the* English ORDINATIONS. 313

into this relation, with all the circumstances and the testimonies upon which it is founded, it will do no more than confirm him in the opinion, that this is only an History forg'd afterwards to make these Ordinations odious, which until then were attack'd without success.

Therefore it has been evidently demonstrated, that there is not in the Ordination, consider'd in it self, any nullity that can render it invalid.

Endeavouring to find out somewhat else, the adversaries have had recourse to exterior proofs; they have maintain'd that the change of the form was made without any lawful authority; that it was the secular power which drew up all the correction that was pretended to be made of the *Roman* pontifical; that though even one should be oblig'd to own, that this regulation was made by the ecclesiastical authority, a particular Church like that of *England*, has no right to change in virtue of her authority the forms of the Sacraments, and that thus, on which side soever you take a view of these alterations, one can do no otherwise but to acknowledge their nullity; which renders the Ordinations invalid, or at least so suspicious, that the doubt arising from thence is alone sufficient to enforce the reiteration of these Ordinations, as if they were evidently invalid.

But all these pretended nullities are not difficult to be destroy'd. It has been shewn in the eleventh Chapter that it was by the ecclesiastical authority that the change was made in the form of Ordination, and that the spiritual power, which the Laws allow the Kings of *England*, regards only the exterior power. <sup>d</sup> "We must know that in Bishops," says Archbishop *Bramhall*, "there is a threefold power. "The first of order, "the second of interior jurisdiction, the third of exterior jurisdiction. The first is referr'd to the consecrating and administering of the Sacraments; the

<sup>d</sup> *Bramhall's Works*, p. 337, 338, 339.

### 314 *A DEFENCE of the Validity*

“ second to the regiment of Christians in the interior court of Conscience; the third to the regiment of Christian people in the exterior court of the Church. Concerning the two former, I know no controversy between the Church of *Rome* and us but one, &c. But we have a controversy with some others, &c. The third power of Bishops—— This the Apostles had not from Christ, nor their successors from them, neither did Christ ever assume any such power to himself in the world.

Besides, it is known that the reformation of the book of Ordination was made by the Bishops, and the Divines nominated for that purpose, and that neither the King nor the Parliament have done any thing upon this head but to give the Bishops protection and authority, which they stood in need of, to make their regulations to be executed, and to maintain the observation of them.

In the tenth Chapter it is prov'd, that a national Church may herself, without exceeding her powers, regulate the forms of the Sacraments, which have not been determin'd by Christ, and upon which there has been no decision of a general Council, nor a plain uniform tradition in the Churches: That the evident possession of so many Churches as well Eastern as Western, is an undisputable proof of it: That this possession is founded upon unanswerable reasons, that is to say, upon the right which each Church has to form her own discipline; upon the independence of Churches with respect to one another in this point; upon the variations which the most considerable Churches have themselves made in their proper form, so little did they think them unalterable: In a word, upon all the reasons which prove that each Church is free as to what does not affect the substance of a Sacrament, because the rest do not properly belong but to that which is styl'd her *Integrity*.

If there be any difficulty about this, that this power ought not to be attributed but to those Churches which



which are not separated from the Catholick Church, it has been prov'd in the same Chapter, that this distinction was not known in the ancient Church, who did not regard as null either the Ordinations or the Sacrifice, or the other Sacraments administer'd by the *Nestorians*, the *Eutychians*, and the other Hereticks; that the alterations have seldom been made but in Schism and Heresy; that the greatest part of the forms themselves or the liturgies were not written until after the birth of the Heresy: That when there was a treaty to re-unite the several sects, there was no mention made either of re-ordinations, or of a renuntiation of their proper ceremonies; in fine, that in the administration of the Sacraments there was nothing ever minded but to be assur'd that the substance was retain'd without examining, if the rites were either introduced or alter'd, during the change and the separation.

Supposing the truth of the facts such as I have reported them, there remains no more but to shew that the Ordinations of the *English* not being faulty, either as to the consecrator, or as to the matter and form; their re-ordinations are contrary to all the receiv'd principles of Divines; that the examples produc'd cannot support even a prejudice, so far are they from a proof; that that which was done in this kind, has no other foundation but the fable of the *Nagg's-head*, or the false notion that the true form of Ordination consisted, at least partly, in the delivery of the instruments; and that this foundation being feeble re-ordinations become indefensible. This is what has been prov'd at large in the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth Chapters. For after having shew'd in the thirteenth Chapter that their re-ordinations could not be supported, either by the practice of the cotemporary Catholicks, or by the sentiments of the later Divines; there is in the fourteenth Chapter a detail of principles contrary to re-ordination, and it is prov'd that these principles do not less accord

### 316 A DEFENCE of the Validity

cord with the *English* than with any other Church separated from the Catholics, because it is prov'd, that the substance of Ordination was preserv'd among them: there is no more difficulty as to the rest.

In short, Schism or Heresy does not of it self annul a Sacrament. It is shewn in the ninth Chapter, that the heretical opinions of those who drew up the form of the new Ordinal, did not influence the validity or invalidity of the *English* Ordinations, because according to the opinion of Divines, nothing but the alteration of the sense of a form can destroy the substance: *Additio verborum quæ debitum formæ sacramentalis sensum corrumpunt, tollit veritatem sacramenti.* And that it is not by the inward intention and the sentiment of the compilers that one judges of the validity of a form, and of a Sacrament.

There is therefore no room for a doubt; and as it is prov'd in the twelfth Chapter, if there be a number of Divines who have really doubted of the validity of the *English* Ordinations, this doubt cannot influence the ordination but so far as it is founded upon solid reasons, or upon facts which frame a sort of conviction. Nevertheless, there is nothing here found of this kind. These facts resolve themselves either into fables or weak inductions which are evidently destroy'd by the most authentick records, by testimonies the most positive, and by facts the least contested. The proofs which we have produc'd of *Barlow's* consecration and of *Parker's*, the comparison of the *Roman* pontifical with *Edward the Sixth's* ritual, the testimony of several acts of the Parliament of *England*, and a great variety of other things of this nature form such sort of demonstration in favour of the *English* Ordinations, with which a reasonable doubt cannot subsist.

As to the reasons which support the Ordinations, as they are all founded upon evident facts and authentick monuments, and that the opposite reasons are only founded upon mere possibilities, and upon

on suspicions destructive to the most solemn acts; it does not appear that there is any comparison to be made of these with the others; and doubts which have no foundation but presumptions and prejudices, can never decide about the validity or invalidity of a Sacrament, when these prejudices or these presumptions are destroy'd by proofs, which are convincing to all them who search less for dispute than instruction.

The Ordination being once ascertain'd, the succession is easy to be establish'd: The same principles concurring to prove the validity of the one, consequently prove the other. All depends upon *Parker's* Ordination, which taking its source in the antient episcopacy, reunites it in his person to the new, and leaves no space to fill which can give suspicion of the least interruption.

This is in the main an abridgment of this dissertation, which appears equally supported by the truth of facts, and by that of theological principles. If there is nothing in it new to the *English*, yet it may perhaps serve to undeceive several of our Divines, who search the truth sincerely, and who have no means of information for want of writings which adjust this controversy. All the benefit it can produce with regard to the *English* is, that they will perceive that we desire nothing less than to deceive ourselves to their disadvantage, and that we are ready to sacrifice to truth and charity, prejudices the most ancient and the most dear to our own proper Interest. It is in short, according to St. *Augustine*, an indispensable duty for us to love truth whether she condemns us or flatters us; and though it be at the expense of the party which we are engag'd to defend, one must not hesitate to pay her the homage which she deserves, and which we cannot refuse her. We ought to be the more inclin'd to it, because a justification of the *English* Ordinations turns intirely to the advantage of the Catholick Church. The acknowledgment of their validity facilitates at least our re-union with the *English*,



*gliss*, and there is nothing which we ought to wish for with more ardor.

Though they separate from us they are still our brethren, and nothing ought to estrange us from what is mark'd with the seal of *Jesus Christ*. I know there yet remains a great many obstacles to surmount; but perhaps if there were as much application us'd to overcome them as several take to perpetuate them, we might at length find less trouble to pull down the wall of division that separates us, and to restore to the Catholick Church one of the most illustrious of her members. This is the only end I propos'd to my self in this treatise. What joy would it be to me if our Saviour *Jesus Christ* should second my intentions, and make use of one of the weakest, the most unworthy of his Ministers to co-operate in so holy a work. But whatever may happen in this matter, it is always good to desire and to endeavour it: And if the execution does not answer my view, I promise my self always the valuable consolation of seeing my intentions approv'd by good men.





PROOFS justifying the Facts advanc'd  
in this Treatise.

---

N<sup>o</sup>. I.

*The Translation of a Letter from the late  
M. J. Ben. Bossuet Bishop of Meaux, to D.  
John Mabillon.*

Germigny, Aug.  
12. 1685.

*Reverend Father,*

I Have with joy receiv'd the marks of your Friendship, and you ought not to doubt that I have less regard for that than esteem for your Virtue: I consider Virtue in as extensive a sense as it is taken in the Country <sup>a</sup> where you are. I was glad to hear that you had freer access to the Libraries there, than was ever granted to any other man, which makes us hope for some new discoveries, which are always useful to confirm the ancient doctrine and tradition of the mother of Churches. We expect the event of the affair of *Molinos*, which has much surpris'd every body, and particularly those who had known him at Rome: I know some that are so zealous for his cause, that they really believe that whatever is done against him is the effect of some private cabal, and that he will come off with credit; but as far we can see into the affair, it has quite a different appearance.

<sup>a</sup> D. Mabillon was then at Rome.

*As to the affairs of England, beside the difficulty in relation to the first Bishops, the authors of the Schism; there is yet another in the time of Cromwell, when it is pretended that the succession of the Ordination was interrupted: The English deny it; and as to the succession in the beginning of the Schism, they maintain that there is no difficulty; and it appears that they have reason on their side. It depends upon fact; and the holy See will not fail to act in this matter according to its ordinary circumspection.*

This puts me in mind of one thing, which according to the news we hear, appears of weight to facilitate the return of *England* and *Germany*, which is the reestablishment of the *Cup*. It was granted by *Pius* the fourth in *Austria* and *Bavaria*; but the remedy had no great effect, because the minds of men were at that time too much heated: The same thing granted at a more favourable juncture, as the present appears to be, when all things are in agitation, might meet with much better success. Could you not throw in a few words and sound their opinions upon this subject? As for my part, I believe that by this compliance, wherein there is no inconvenience, but which we might hope to surmount, especially after it has been used thirteen hundred years, we should see the intire ruin of Heresy. The greatest part of our *Hugonots* already explain themselves in high terms. As for our <sup>b</sup> articles, it is a more nice subject, and I believe upon that head we ought to content our selves with our liberty. I salute *D. Michel* with all my heart, and am with a perfect sincerity, my reverend Father,

*Your very humble Servant*

*James Benigne, Bishop of Meaux.*

<sup>b</sup> *He speaks here of the four Articles of the Clergy [of France.]*



Nº. II.

*Extracts from several Acts of Parliament  
referr'd to in this Work.*

I. An Act of Parliament declaring King *Henry VIII.* head of the Church of *England*, made in the twenty sixth year of his reign.

**A**lbeit the King's Majesty justly and rightfully is, and ought to be the supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognized by the Clergy of this realm in their convocations, yet nevertheless, for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ's Religion within this realm of England, and to repress and extirp all errors, heresies, and other enormities and abuses heretofore used in the same: Be it enacted by authority of this present Parliament, that the King our sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, Kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called Anglicana Ecclesia; And shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the imperial Crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honours, dignities, preheminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits and commodities, to the said dignity of supreme head of the same Church belonging and appertaining: And that our said sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, Kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority from time to time, to visit, repress, repress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought, or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's Religion,

Y

## 322 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

ligion, and for the conseruation of the peace, unity and tranquillity of this realm; any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription, or any thing or things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding. Rep. 1 & 2. P. & M. 8. ft. 8 Eliz. 1.

II. An Act that no person may apply to *Rome*, but to the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, or to some other Bishop, for dispensations.

**A**ND be it farther enacted by the authority aforesaid, That neither your Highness, your heirs nor successors, Kings of this realm, nor any your subjects of this realm, nor of any other your dominions, shall from henceforth sue to the said Bishop of Rome called the Pope, or to the see of Rome, or to any person or persons, having or pretending any authority by the same, for licences, dispensations, compositions, faculties, &c. — for any cause or matter for the which any licence, dispensation, &c. heretofore hath been used and accustomed to be had and obtained at the see of Rome, or by authority thereof, or of any prelates of this realm, nor for any manner of other licences, dispensations, &c. or any other instruments or writings that in causes of necessity may lawfully be granted without offending the holy Scriptures and laws of God. But that from henceforth every such licence, dispensation, &c. necessary for your Highness, your heirs and successors, and your and their people and subjects upon the due examinations of the causes and qualities of the persons procuring such dispensations, licences, &c. or other writings shall be granted, had and obtained from time to time, within this your realm, and other your dominions, and not elsewhere, In manner and form following, and none otherwise: That is to say, the Archbishop of *Canterbury* for the time being and his successors, shall have power and authority from time to time by their discretions, to give, grant and dispose by an instrument under the seal of the said Archbishop,

bishop, unto your Majesty, and to your heirs and successors Kings of this realm, as well all manner such licences, dispensations, &c. and all other writings for causes not being contrary or repugnant to the holy scriptures and laws of God, as heretofore hath been used and accustomed to be had and obtained by your Highness, or any your most noble progenitors, or any of your or their subjects, at the see of Rome, or any person or persons by authority of the same, And all other licences, dispensations, faculties, &c. and other writings, in, for, and upon all such causes and matters as shall be convenient and necessary to be had for the honour and surety of your Highness, your heirs and successors, and the wealth and profit of this your Realm: So that the said Archbishop, or any of his successors in no manner wise shall grant any dispensation, licence, rescript, or any other writing aforesaid rehearsed, for any cause or matter repugnant to the law of Almighty God.

In the same chapter N<sup>o</sup>. 4. the Archbishop may only grant such Licenses of things wonted to be licensed; but for those that are obsolete he is prohibited to grant them without the King's consent. And in N<sup>o</sup>. 17. it is said, that if the Archbishop refuses to grant the said dispensation, the Chancellor or Keeper of the great seal is to determine if the refusal be just and reasonable; if it appear so, it will be approved of; but if it appear unjust, the Archbishop will be order'd to grant the dispensation required, in default of which he is to be fined at the King's pleasure, and the King is to appoint two other Prelates to grant the dispensation necessary; which proves that they never pretended to act in a spiritual matter independently of the ecclesiastical authority.



III. An Act concerning the Consecration of a Bishop,  
made the twenty fifth of *Hen. VIII.*

**B**E it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that whensoever any such presentment or nomination shall be made by the King's Highness, his heirs or successors, by virtue and authority of this act, and according to the tenor of the same: That then every Archbishop and Bishop, into whose hands any such presentment and nomination shall be directed, shall with all speed and celerity, invest and consecrate the person nominate and presented by the King's Highness, his heirs or successors, to the office and dignity that such person shall be so presented unto, and give and use to him pall, and all other benedictions, ceremonies and things requisite for the same, without suing, procuring or obtaining hereafter any bulls, or other things at the see of Rome, for any such office or dignity in that behalf— And then after he hath made such oath and fealty only to the King's Majesty, his heirs and successors, as shall be limited for the same, the King's Highness, by his Letters Patents under his great seal, shall signify the said election to one Archbishop, and two other Bishops, or else to four Bishops within this realm, or within any other the King's dominions, to be assigned by the King's Highness, his heirs or successors, requiring and commanding the said Archbishop and Bishops with all speed and celerity, to confirm the said election, and to invest and consecrate the said person so elected to the office and dignity that he is elected unto, and to give and use to him such pall, benedictions, ceremonies, and all other things requisite for the same, without suing, procuring or obtaining any bulls, briefs, or other things at the said see of Rome, or by the authority thereof in any behalf.

And be it farther enacted by the authority aforesaid, That every person and persons being hereafter chosen, elected, nominate, presented, invested, and consecrated

erated to the dignity or office of any Archbishop or Bishop within this realm, or within any other the King's dominions, according to the form, tenor, and effect of this present act, and suing their temporalities, out of the King's hands, his heirs or successors, as hath been accustomed, and making a corporal oath to the King's Highness, and to none other, in form as is afore rehearsed, shall and may from henceforth be trononised or installed, as the case shall require, And shall have and take their only restitution out of the King's hands, of all the possessions and profits spiritual and temporal belonging to the said archbishoprick or bishoprick whereunto they shall be so elected or presented, and shall be obeyed in all manner of things, according to the name, title, degree, and dignity that they shall be so chosen or presented unto, and do and execute in every thing and things touching the same, as any Archbishop or Bishop of this realm without offending of the prerogative royal of the Crown and the laws and customs of this realm might at any time heretofore do.

And be it farther enacted by the authority aforesaid, That if the Prior and Convent of any Monastery, or Dean and Chapter of any cathedral Church where the see of an Archbishop or Bishop is within any the King's dominions, after such licence, as is afore rehearsed, shall be delivered to them, proceed not to election, and signifie the same according to the tenor of this Act within the space of twenty days next after such licence shall come to their hands: Or else if any Archbishop or Bishop within any the King's dominions, after any such election, nomination or presentation shall be signified unto them by the King's Letters Patents, shall refuse, and do not confirm, invest and consecrate with all due circumstance, as is aforesaid, every such person as shall be so elected, nominated, or presented, and to them signified, as is above mentioned, within twenty days next after the King's Letters Patents of such signification or presentation shall come to their hands, Or else if any of them, or any other person or persons, ad-

## 326 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

mit, maintain, allow, obey, do, or execute any censures, excommunications, interdictions, inhibitions, or any other process or act of what nature, name, or quality soever it be to the contrary, or let of due execution of this act, That then every — person — so offending and doing contrary to this Act — shall run in the dangers, pains and penalties of the estatute of Prohibition and Præmunire, made in the five and twentieth year of the reign of King Edward III, and in the sixteenth year of King Richard II.

*Statutes relating to the Consecration of Bishops under Edward the Sixth, in the Parliaments of 1549 and 1552.*

IV. An Act in the year 1549, to order the drawing up a new form of Ordination.

**S**uch form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and other Ministers of the Church, as by six Prelates, and six other men of this realm learned in God's law, by the King to be appointed and assigned, or by the most number of them shall be devised for that purpose, and set forth under the great seal before the first of April next coming, shall be lawfully exercised and used, and none other.

V. An Act in 1552, to annex the Ordinal to *The Book of Common-Prayer*.

**B**ecause there hath risen in the use and exercise of the aforesaid common service in the Church, heretofore set forth, divers doubts for the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same, rather by the curiosity of the minister and mistakers, then of any other worthy cause: Therefore as well for the more plain and manifest explanation thereof, as for the more perfection of the



the said order or common service, in some places where it is necessary to make the same Prayer and fashion of service more earnest and fit to stir christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God, The King's most excellent Majesty, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same hath caused the aforesaid order of common service, entituled, The Book of Common-Prayer, to be faithfully and godly perused, explained, and made fully perfect, and by the aforesaid authority hath annexed and joyned it, so explained and perfected, to this present Statute; Adding also a form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons to be of like force, authority and value, as the same like aforesaid book, entituled, The Book of Common-Prayer was before, and to be accepted, received, used, and esteemed in like sort and manner, and with the same clauses of provisions and exceptions to all intents, constructions and purposes, as by the Act of Parliament made in the second year of the King's Majesties reign, was ordained, limited, expressed, and appointed for the uniformity of service, and administration of the Sacraments throughout the realm, upon such several pains, as in the said Act of Parliament is expressed: And the said former Act to stand in full force and strength, to all intents and constructions, and to be applied, practised, and put in ure; to and for the establishing of The Book of Common-Prayer, now explained and hereunto annexed, and also the said form of making Archbishops, Bishops, or Priests and Deacons hereunto annexed, as it was for the former book.

VI. An Act of Parliament in the first of *Mary* in 1553, to repeal the two preceding Acts made under *Edward VI.*

**A**<sup>a</sup> Repeal . . . . of the Stat. of Ed. VI. 12. made for the ordering of ecclesiastical Ministers, and of the Stat. of 5 Ed. VI. 1. made for the uniformity of Common-Prayer and administration of the Sacraments— All such divine service and administration of Sacraments as were most commonly used in England in the last year of King Henry VIII, shall be used thorow the realm after the twentieth day of December An. Dom. 1553, and no other kind of service, nor administrations of Sacraments.

VII. An Act made in 1559 under Queen *Elizabeth*, to re-establish *The Book of Common-Prayer* drawn up under *Edw. VI.*

**W**here at the death of our late Sovereign Lord King Edward VI, there remained one uniform order of common service and prayer, and of the administration of Sacraments, Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England, which was set forth in one book, entituled, *The Book of Common-Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of England*, authorized by Act of Parliament holden in the fifth and sixth years of our said late Sovereign Lord King Edward VI, entituled, An Act for the Uniformity of Common-Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments; the which was repealed and taken away by Act of Parliament in the first year of the reign of our late Sovereign Lady Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's Religion.

<sup>a</sup> The Statute is not given entire, but only abridg'd in these words.

Be it therefore enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, That the said statute of repeal, and every thing therein contained, only concerning the said book, and the service and administration of the Sacraments, Rites and Ceremonies contained or appointed in, or by the said book, shall be void and of none effect, from and after the Feast of the Nativity of Saint John Baptist next coming, And that the said book with the order of service, and of the administration of Sacraments, Rites and Ceremonies, with the alterations and additions therein added and appointed by this statute, shall stand and be from and after the said Feast of the Nativity of Saint John Baptist, in full force and effect, according to the tenour and effect of this statute, any thing in the foresaid statute of repeal to the contrary notwithstanding.

And further be it enacted by the Queen's Highness, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that all and singular Ministers—shall from and after the Feast of the Nativity of Saint John Baptist next coming, be bounden to say and use the Mattens, Even-song, celebration of the Lord's Supper, and administration of each of the Sacraments, and all the common and open prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said book so authorized by Parliament, in the said fifth and sixth years of the reign of King Edward VI, with one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the communicants, and none other, or otherwise.

VIII. An Act of Parliament in 1566, declaring the validity of the Ordinations made since 1559.

As much as divers questions by overmuch boldness of speech and talk amongst many of the common sort of people being unlearned, hath lately grown upon the



the making and consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops within this realm whether the same were, and be duly and orderly done according to the law or not, which is much tending to the slander of all the state of Clergy, being one of the greatest states of this realm: Therefore for the avoiding of such slanderous speech, and to the intent that every man that is willing to know the truth, may plainly understand that the same evil speech and talk is not grounded upon any just matter or cause, it is thought convenient hereby partly to touch such authorities as do allow and approve the making and consecrating of the same Archbishops and Bishops to be duly and orderly done according to the Laws of this realm, and thereupon further to provide for the more surety thereof, as hereafter shall be expressed.——

Wherefore for the plain declaration of all the premises, and to the intent that the same may the better be known to every of the Queen's Majesties subjects, whereby such evil speech as heretofore hath been used against the high state of Prelacy may hereafter cease, Be it now declared and enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, That the said Act and Statute made in the first year of the reign of our said Sovereign Lady the Queen's Majesty, whereby the said Book of Common-Prayer and the administration of Sacraments, with other Rites and Ceremonies is authorized and allowed to be used, shall stand and remain good and perfect to all respects and purposes; And that such order and form for the consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops, and for the making of Priests, Deacons, and Ministers, as was set forth in the time of the said late King Edward VI, and added to the said Book of Common-Prayer, and authorized by Parliament in the fifth and sixth years of the said late King, shall stand and be in full force and effect, and shall from henceforth be used and observed in all places within this realm, and other the Queen's Majesties dominions and countries.

And

And that all acts and things heretofore had, made or done by any person or persons, in or about any Consecration, Confirmation, or Investing of any person or persons elected to the office or dignity of any Archbishop or Bishop within this realm, or within any other the Queen's Majesties dominions or countries, by virtue of the Queen's Majesties Letters Patents or Commission thence the beginning of her Majesties reign, be and shall be by authority of this present Parliament, declared, judged, and deemed at and from every of the several times of the doing thereof, good and perfect to all respects and purposes; any matter or thing that can, or may be objected to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding.

And that all persons that have been, or shall be made, ordered or consecrate Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers of God's holy Word and Sacraments, or Deacons after the form and order prescribed in the said order and form how Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and Ministers should be consecrated, made and ordered, be in very deed, and also by authority hereof, declared and enacted to be, and shall be Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers and Deacons, and rightly made, ordered and consecrated; any statute, law, canon, or other thing to the contrary notwithstanding.

It plainly appears by this Statute, that it was not the Parliament that gave validity to the Ordinations, but supposed them valid, and acknowledged them such, and consequently declares them such.

IX. An Act of Parliament in 1597, to confirm the deposition of the old Bishops and other dignitaries, and the substituting of the new. *An. 39 Eliz.*

**W**hereas divers and sundry persons exercising the office and function of Bishops and Deans of divers sees and bishopricks and deanries within this realm, in the reign of our late Sovereign Lady  
Queen

Queen Mary, were before the tenth day of November, in the fourth year of the most happy and blessed government of the Queen's most excellent Majesty that now is lawfully and justly deprived from such bishopricks and deanries as they severally enjoyed, and took upon them to hold, and in their steads and places sundry excellent and worthy men duly preferred to the same: And whereas the parties so deprived did notwithstanding, as it is pretended, make secret appeals, and used other secret means, pretending thereby to support the continuance of their said offices and functions.

1. Be it therefore declared and enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, that all and every deprivation and deprivations, and all every sentence and sentences of deprivation whatsoever, had, pronounced, or given at any time between the beginning of the reign of the Queen's most excellent Majesty that now is, and the tenth day of November in the fourth year of the same, against any person or persons which was, or took upon him to be Archbishop or Bishop of any see or Bishoprick, or Dean of any deanry within this realm, or any the dominions thereof, in the reign of the said late Queen Mary, from such see or bishoprick, shall be adjudged, deemed, and taken good and sufficient in law, to all intents and purposes, and so shall remain and continue; any appeal, exception, or other matter or thing whatsoever to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding.

2. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That all such Archbishops, and Bishops, and Deans, as were ordained or made by the authority or licence of the Queen's Majesty that now is, at any time between the beginning of her reign, and the said tenth day of November in the fourth year of her Majesties reign, shall be taken and adjudged to be lawful Archbishop or Bishop of the see or bishoprick, and Dean of the deanry unto the which he was so preferred, assigned or appointed: And that the same see of archbishoprick or bishoprick and deanry unto which he was preferred,



preferred, assigned or appointed, shall be deemed and adjudged to be merely void to all respects and purposes, before such presentment, appointment or assignment so made as aforesaid; any ambiguity or question in that behalf heretofore made, or hereafter to be made to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.

It is plain, as one may see, by the words of this statute, that the validity of Ordinations is not here pointed at, nor the doubts which arose upon that subject, but only, if the sees were lawfully vacant by the deposition of the persons who had fill'd them, and if the substitution of those that were put into their room was lawful.

*N. B.* The author had here inserted the greatest part of our Ordinal, as it has stood since King *Charles the Second's* reign, but the translator has thought fit to omit it, because it is in every *English* readers hands; and therefore he has contented himself with inserting the variations between it and the old Ordinal of *Edward the Sixth*, as follows.

---

Alterations made in the *English* Ordinal under  
*Charles the Second.*

Nº. III.

I. *Changes made in the Ordination of Priests.*

1. **T**HERE were some alterations made in the order and disposition of the prayers. In the first edition the ceremony began with the reading of the Epistle and Gospel, and was follow'd with the hymn *Veni Creator*, after which the Archdeacon presented the persons to be ordain'd, then followed the notification the Bishop made to the people, and a collect. This order was a little alter'd in the Ordinal reform'd in *Charles the Second's* time. For it begins with presenting the Candidates

### 334 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

didates and the notification which the Bishop makes to the people, after which he reads a collect, then follow the Epistle and Gospel, which are different from those in the ancient Ordinal.

2. The same exhortation and the same interrogatories are in both the one and the other; after which, in the new reform'd ritual the hymn *Veni Creator* is plac'd, which in the ancient was sung after the Gospel. At last comes the prayer which holds the place of the preface in the *Roman pontifical*, and which is follow'd by the imposition of hands, together with a form which has been varied in the new Ordinal; for in the old one it is thus. *Receave the holy Ghost, whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven; and whose sins thou doste retaine thei are reteined. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy Sacramentes; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost.* But in the new ritual this form is thus alter'd. *Receive the holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy Sacraments: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost. Amen.*

3. In the first edition of King *Edward's* ritual it is remarkable, that after the delivery of the Evangelists into the hands of the ordain'd, that the Creed was to be sung without determining which Creed; but in that which was reform'd under *Charles the Second*, it is observable that it should be the *Nicene Creed*. *When this is done the Nicene Creed shall be sung or said.* After which there is a collect, with which the Ordination concludes in the first edition of *Edward's* ritual; but in that reform'd under *Charles the Second*, this collect is follow'd by another prayer and benediction, which are proper to insert here.

The Prayer.

*Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings, with thy most gracious favour, and further us with thy continual help, that in all our works begun, continu'd, and ended in thee, we may glorify thy holy name, and finally, by thy mercy obtain everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.*

The Benediction.

*The peace of God which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. And the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghost, be amongst you, and remain with you always. Amen.*

II. *Changes made in the Ordination of Bishops.*

I. **T**HE new office begins with a collect which is not in the first edition, and which for that reason we have here inserted.

*Almighty God, who by thy Son Jesus Christ, didst give to thy holy Apostles many excellent gifts, and didst charge them to feed thy flock; give grace, we beseech thee, to all Bishops, the pastors of thy Church, that they may diligently preach thy word, and duly administer the godly discipline thereof; and grant to the people that they may obediently follow the same, that all may receive the crown of everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.*

2. After the reading of the Gospel, the ritual of *Charles the Second* takes notice, that the *Nicene Creed* is to be sung, which was not determin'd in the former edition. It also directs, that a sermon be preach'd, and that afterwards the Bishop elect, vested with his rochet, be presented to the Archbishop; but in the first Ordinal there is no mention made of a sermon, nor of a rochet.

3. In



### 336 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

3. In the rest of the ceremony I observe no more than two alterations worthy of notice. The first is among the interrogatories put to the Bishop elect, where there is one added not anciently us'd; namely this here. *Will you be faithful in ordaining, sending, or laying hands upon others?* With this answer, *I will so be, by the help of God.* The second is, that the form is also determin'd which is annex'd to the imposition of hands. *Receive the holy Ghost,* for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost, Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by this imposition of our hands: For God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love and soberness.*

4. The ancient ritual does not in terms direct what posture the Bishop is to be in, over whom these words are pronounc'd; but the new ritual specifies that he is to be upon his knees. The prayer and benediction which the new Ordinal adds in the ceremony of the Ordination of Priests after the collect, which in the old concluded the office, are also added after the same collect in the ceremony of the Ordination of Bishops. And these are the amount of the several alterations which the reviewers have made in the new Ordinal, in the time of *Charles the Second*. It is easy to judge by these alone, if there be the least appearance that these alterations could contribute any thing to the validity or to the invalidity of an Ordination.

Nº. IV.

*A general power given by Pope Julius the Third to Cardinal Pole, to reconcile England to the Church of Rome.*

JULIUS P P. III.

**D**ilecte fili noster, salutem & apostolicam benedictionem. Dudum cum charissima in Christo filia nostra Maria, Angliæ tunc princeps, regina declarata fuisset, & speraretur regnum Angliæ, quod sævâ regum tyrannide ab unione sanctæ ecclesiæ Catholicæ separatum fuerat, ad ovile gregis Domini, & ejusdem ecclesiæ unionem, ipsâ Mariâ primùm regnante, redire posse: Nos te præstanti virtute, singulari pietate, ac multâ doctrinâ insignem, ad eandem Mariam reginam, & universum Angliæ regnum, de fratrum nostrorum consilio & unanimi consensu, nostrum & apostolicæ sedis legatum de latere destinavimus; tibi que inter cætera, omnes & singulos utriusque sexûs, tam laïcas quam ecclesiasticas, sæculares, & quorumvis ordinum regulares personas, in quibusvis etiam sacris ordinibus constitutas, cujuscunque statûs, gradûs, conditionis & qualitatis extiterint, ac quacunque ecclesiastica etiam episcopali, archiepiscopali, & patriarchali, aut mundana, etiam marchionali, ducali, aut regia dignitate præfulgerent, etiam capitulum, collegium, universitas, seu communitas forent, quarumcunque hæresium aut novarum sectarum professores, aut in eis culpabiles vel suspectas ac credentes, receptatores & fautores eorum, etiamsi relapsæ fuissent, eorum errorem cognoscentes & de illis dolentes, ac ad orthodoxam fidem recipi humiliter postulantes, cognitâ in eis verâ & non fictâ aut simulatâ pœnitentiâ in omnibus & singulis per eos perpetratis (hæreses & ab eadem fide apostasias, blasphemias, & alios quoscunque errores etiam sub generali sermone non venientes sapientibus)

Z

338 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

bus) peccatis, criminibus, excessibus & delictis, necnon excommunicationum, suspensionum, interdictorum, & aliis ecclesiasticis ac temporalibus, etiam corporis afflictivis, & capitalibus sententiis, censuris & pœnis in eos, præmissorum occasione, à jure vel ab homine latis vel promulgatis, etiam si in iis viginti & plus annis inforduissent, & eorum absolutio nobis & divinæ fedi, & per literas in die cœnæ Domini legi consuetas reservata existeret, in utroque conscientiæ videlicet & contentioso foro, plenariè absolvendi & liberandi, ac aliorum Christi fidelium consortio aggregandi: necnon cum eis super irregularitate per eos præmissorum occasione, etiam quia sic ligati missas & alia divina officia, etiam contra ritus & ceremonias ab ecclesia eatenus probatas & usitatas celebrassent, aut illis aliàs se miscuissent, contracta; necnon bigama per eosdem ecclesiasticos, seculares vel regulares, verè aut fictè, seu aliàs qualitercumque inversa (etiam si ex eo quòd clerici in sacris constituti, cum viduis vel aliis corruptis matrimonium contraxissent prætenderetur) rejectis & expulsis tamen priùs uxoribus sic de facto copulatis: quodque bigamiâ & irregularitate, ac aliis præmissis non obstantibus, in eorum ordinibus, dummodò ante eorum lapsum in hæresim hujusmodi ritè & legitimè promoti vel ordinati fuissent, etiam in altaris ministerio ministrare, ac quæcunque & qualitercumque etiam curata beneficia secularia vel regularia, ut priùs, dummodò super eis alteri jus quæsitum non existeret, retinere: & non promoti ad omnes etiam sacros & presbyteratûs ordines, ab eorum ordinariis, si digni & idonei reperti fuissent, promoveri, ac beneficia ecclesiastica, si iis aliàs canonicè conferrentur, recipere & retinere valerent, dispensandi & indulgendi: ac omnem infamiæ & inhabilitatis maculam sive notam, ex præmissis quomodolibet insurgentem, penitùs & omninò abolendi, necnon ad pristinos honores, dignitates, famam, & patriam, & bona etiam confiscata, in pristinumque, & eum in quo ante præmissa quomodolibet erant, statu-



stum restituendi, reponendi, & reintegrandi: ac eis, dummodò corde contriti eorum errata & excessus alicui per eos eligendo catholico confessori sacramentaliter confiterentur, ac pœnitentiam salutarem, eis per ipsum confessorem propterea injungendam omninò adimplerent, omnem publicam confessionem, abjurationem, renunciationem, & pœnitentiam jure debitam arbitrio suo moderandi, vel in totum remittendi. Necnon communitates & universitates, ac singulares personas quascumque à quibusvis illicitis pactionibus & conventionibus per eos cum dominis aberrantibus, seu in eorum favorem quomodolibet initis, & iis præstitis juramentis & homagiis, illorumque omnium observatione, & si quem eatenus occasione eorum incurrissent perjurii reatum, etiam absolvendi, & juramenta ipsa relaxandi. Ac quoscunque regulares & religiosos, etiam in hæresim hujusmodi, ut præfertur, lapsos, extra eorum regularia loca absque dictæ sedis licentia vagantes, ab apostasiæ reatu & excommunicationis, aliisque censuris ac pœnis ecclesiasticis, per eos propterea etiam juxta suorum ordinum instituta incurfis, pariter absolvendi: ac cum eis ut alicui beneficio ecclesiastico curato de illud obtinentis consensu, etiam in habitu clerici secularis, habitum suum regularem sub honesta toga presbyteri secularis deferendo, deservire, & extra eadem regularia loca remanere liberè & licitè possint, dispensandi. Necnon quibusvis personis, etiam ecclesiasticis, ut quadragesimalibus & aliis anni temporibus & diebus, quibus usus ovorum & carniū est de jure prohibitus, butyro, & caseo, & aliis lacticiiniis, ac dictis ovis & carniibus, de utriusque seu alterius, spiritualis, qui catholicus existeret, medici consilio, aut si locorum & personarum qualitate inspectâ ex defectu piscium, aut olei, vel indispositione personarum earumdem, seu aliâ causâ legitimâ, id tibi faciendum videretur, ut tuo arbitrio uti & vesci possint, indulgendi & concedendi. Necnon per te in præteritis duntaxat casibus, aliquos clericos seculares, tantum presbyteros, diaco-

340 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

nos, aut subdiaconos, qui matrimonium cum aliquibus virginibus, vel corruptis secularibus etiam mulieribus de facto eatenus contraxissent, consideratâ aliquâ ipsorum singulari qualitate, & cognitâ eorum verâ ad Christi fidem conversione, ac aliis circumstantiis ac modificationibus tuo tantum arbitrio adhibendis, ex quibus aliis præsertim clericis in sacris ordinibus hujusmodi constitutis, quibus non licet uxores habere, scandalum omninò non generetur, citra tamen altaris, ac alia sacerdotum ministeria, & titulos beneficiorum ecclesiasticorum, ac omni ipsorum ordinum exercitio sublato, ab excommunicationis sententiâ, & aliis reatibus propterea incurfis, injunctâ inde eis etiam tuo arbitrio poenitentiâ salutari, absolvendi, ac cum eis, dummodò alter eorum superstes remaneret, de cætero sine spe conjugii, quod inter se matrimonium legitimè contrahere, & in eo, postquam contractum foret, licitè remanere possent, prolem exinde legitimam decernendo, misericorditer dispensandi: ac quæcumque beneficia ecclesiastica, tam secularia quàm regularia, & quæ per rectores catholicos possidebantur, de ipsorum tamen rectorum catholicorum consensu, seu absque eorum præjudicio, cuicumque alteri beneficio ecclesiastico ob ejus fructûs tenuitatem, aut hospitali jam erecto vel erigendo, seu studio universali, vel scholis literariis, uniendi, annectendi, & incorporandi, aut fructus, redditus, & proventus, seu bonorum beneficiorum dividendi, separandi & dismembrandi, ac eorum sic divisorum, separatorem, & dismembratorum partem aliis beneficiis seu hospitalibus, vel studiis aut scholis, seu piis usibus similiter arbitrio tuo perpetuò applicandi & appropriandi. Ac cum possessoribus bonorum ecclesiasticorum (restitutis priùs, si tibi expedire videretur, immobilibus per eos indebitè detentis) super fructibus malè perceptis, ac bonis mobilibus consumptis, concordandi, & transigendi, ac eos desuper liberandi & quietandi: ac quicquid ex concordiiis & transactionibus hujusmodi proveniret, in ecclesia cujus essent bona,

na, vel in studiorum universalium, aut scholarum hujusmodi, seu alios pios usus convertendi, omniaque & singula alia, in quæ in præmissis & circa ea quomodolibet necessaria & opportuna esse cognosceres, faciendi, dicendi, gerendi & exercendi: necnon catholicos locorum ordinarios, aut alias personas Deum timentes, fide insignes, & literarum scientiâ præditas, ac gravitate morum conspicuas, & ætate venerandâ, de quarum probitate & circumspectione, ac charitatis zelo plena fiducia conspici posset, ad præmissa omnia, cum simili vel limitata potestate (absolutione & dispensatione clericorum circa connubia, ac unione beneficiorum, seu eorum fructuum & bonorum separatione, & applicatione, ac concordia cum possessoribus bonorum ecclesiasticorum & eorum liberatorum, duntaxat exceptis) substituendi & subdelegandi: ac diversas alias facultates per diversas alias nostras tam sub plumbo quam in forma brevis confectas literas, concessimus, prout in illis plenius continetur. Verum cum tu ad partes Flandriæ, ex quibus brevissima ad regnum transfretatio existit, te contuleris, ac ex certis rationalibus nobis notis causis inibi aliquandiu subsistere habeas, ac à nonnullis nimium forsan scrupulosis, hæsitetur, an tu in partibus hujusmodi subsistens, prædictis ac aliis tibi concessis facultatibus uti, ac in eodem regno locorum ordinarios, aut alias personas, ut præmittitur, qualificatas, quæ facultatibus per te juxta dictarum literarum continentiam pro tempore concessis utantur, alias juxta earumdem literarum prædictarum tenorem substituere, & delegare possis: Nos causam tuæ subsistentiæ in eisdem partibus approbantes, & singularum literarum prædictarum tenores, præsentibus pro sufficienter expressis, ac de verbo ad verbum insertis, habentes, circumspectioni tuæ quòd quandiu in eisdem partibus de licentia nostra moram traxeris, legatione tua prædicta durante, etiam extra ipsum regnum existens, omnibus & singulis prædictis, & quibusvis aliis tibi concessis, & quæ per præsentis tibi conceduntur, facultatibus, e-



342 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

tiam erga quoscunque archiepiscopos, episcopos, ac abbates, aliosque ecclesiarum tam secularium quàm quorumvis ordinum regularium, necnon monasteriorum & aliorum locorum regularium praelatos, non secus ac erga alios inferiores clericos, uti possis, necnon erga alias personas in singulis literis prædictis quovis modo nominatas, ad te pro tempore recurrentes vel mittentes, etiam circa ordines quos nunquam aut malè susceperunt, & munus consecrationis quod iis ab aliis episcopis vel archiepiscopis etiam hæreticis & schismaticis, aut aliàs minùs ritè & non servatâ formâ ecclesiæ consuetâ impensum fuit, etiam si ordines & munus hujusmodi etiam circa altaris ministerium temerè executi sint, per te ipsum vel alios, ad id à te pro tempore deputatos, liberè uti, ac in eodem regno tot quot tibi videbuntur locorum ordinarios, vel alias personas, ut præmittitur, qualificatas, quæ facultatibus per te, eis pro tempore concessis (citra tamen eas quæ solùm tibi, ut præfertur, concessæ existunt) etiam te in partibus Flandriæ hujusmodi subsistente, liberè utantur; & eas exercent & exequantur aliàs, juxta ipsarum literarum continentiam ac tenorem substituere & subdelegare. Necnon de personis quorumcunque episcoporum vel archiepiscoporum, qui metropolitanam aut alias cathedrales ecclesias de manu laicorum etiam schismaticorum, & præsertim qui de Henrici regis & Edvardi ejus nati receperunt, & eorum regimini & administrationi se ingesserunt, & eorum fructus, redditus & proventus etiam longissimo tempore, tanquam veri archiepiscopi aut episcopi temerè & de facto usurpando, etiam si in hæresim; ut præfertur, inciderint, seu antea hæretici fuerint, postquam per te unitati sanctæ matris ecclesiæ restituti extiterint, tuque eos rehabilitandos esse censueris; si tibi aliàs digni & idonei videbuntur; eisdem metropolitanis & aliis cathedralibus ecclesiis denudò; necnon quibusvis aliis cathedralibus etiam metropolitanis ecclesiis per obitum vel privationem illarum præsulum, seu aliàs quovis modo pro tempore

vacan-

vacantibus, de personis idoneis pro quibus ipsa Maria regina juxta consuetudines ipsius regni, tibi supplicaverit, autoritate nostra providere, ipsasque personas eisdem ecclesiis in episcopos aut archiepiscopos præficere: Ac cum iis qui ecclesias cathedrales & metropolitanas de manu laïcorum, etiam schismaticorum, ut præfertur, receperunt, quod eisdem seu aliis, ad quas eas aliàs ritè transferri contigerit, cathedralibus etiam metropolitanis ecclesiis, in episcopos vel archiepiscopos præesse, ipsasque ecclesias in spiritualibus & temporalibus regere & gubernare, ac munere consecrationis eis hætenùs impenso uti, vel si illud eis nondum impensum exstiterit, ab episcopis vel archiepiscopis catholicis per te nominandis suscipere liberè & licitè possint. Necnon cum quibusvis per te, ut præmittitur, pro tempore absolutis & rehabilitatis, ut eorum erroribus & excessibus præteritis non obstantibus, quibusvis cathedralibus, etiam metropolitanis ecclesiis in episcopos & archiepiscopos præfici & præesse, illasque in eisdem spiritualibus & temporalibus regere & gubernare: ac ad quoscunque etiam sacros & presbyteratûs ordines promovere, & in illis aut per eos jam licèt minùs ritè susceptis ordinibus etiam in altaris ministerio ministrare, necnon munus consecrationis suscipere, & illo uti liberè & licitè valeant, dispensare etiam liberè & licitè possis, plenam & liberam apostolicam auctoritatem per præsentem concedimus facultatem & potestatem: non obstantibus constitutionibus & ordinationibus apostolicis, ac omnibus illis, quæ in singulis literis præteritis voluimus non obstare, cæterisque contrariis quibuscunque.

Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum sub annulo piscatoris die 8 Martii 1554, pontificatûs nostri anno quinto.

The words of this Bull are very precise: the Prelates ordain'd under *Edward*, are not distinguish'd from those under *Henry*; and the validity of the Ordination of these being not disputed, there was no need but to reestablish them; therefore it was not then believ'd at *Rome* that *Edward's* Ordinal affected

# 344 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

the essentials of Ordination, and the degradations perform'd under *Mary* prove nothing, since the same conduct was observ'd as to Bishops and Priests ordain'd under *Henry*.

## Nº. V.

*A collection of Records relating to Parker.*

**C**ardinal *Pole* dying in 1558, the Archbishoprick of *Canterbury* continu'd vacant until the eighteenth of *July* 1559, when at the request of the Chapter, *Elizabeth* granted a *Conge de Eglise*. After the ordinary formalities, the election was made the first of *August*, and *M. Parker* being elected, accepted the election the sixth of the same month. The Records of this transaction are publish'd in *Bramhall*, but as they are not necessary for us, we have contented ourselves to transcribe the following, taken out of the Registers of *Canterbury*, or out of *Kymer's Fœdera*.

*Queen Elizabeth's first Letters Patents for the Confirmation and Consecration of Parker.*

**E**lizabetha Dei gratia, Angliæ, &c. Reverendis in Christo patribus, Cuthberto episcopo Dunelmensi, Gilberto Bathoniensi episcopo, David episcopo Burgi S. Petri, Antonio Landaveni episcopo, Will. Barloo episcopo, & Johan. Scory episcopo, salutem.

Cùm vacante nuper Sede archiepiscopali Cantuariensi per mortem naturalem D. Reginaldi Pole cardinalis, ultimi & immediati archiepiscopi & pastoris ejusdem, ad humilem petitionem decani & capituli ecclesiæ nostræ cathedralis & metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariensis, eisdem per literas nostras patentes licentiam concessimus alium sibi eligendi in archiepiscopum & pastorem Sedis prædictæ, ac iidem decanus & capitulum vigore & obtentu licentiæ nostræ prædictæ, dilectum nobis in Christo Magistrum Math. Parker



ker S. Theologiæ professorem sibi & ecclesiæ prædictæ elegerint in archiepiscopum & pastorem, prout per literas suas patentes sigillo eorum communi sigillatas, nobis inde directas, plenius liquet & apparet.

Nos, electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni regium nostrum assensum adhibuimus pariter & favorem, & hoc vobis tenore præsentium significamus.

Rogantes, ac in fide & dilectione, quibus nobis tenemini, firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenus eundem Mag. Math. Parker in archiepiscopum & pastorem ecclesiæ cathedralis & metropoliticae Christi Cantuariensis prædictæ, sic, ut præfertur, electum, electionemque prædictam confirmare, & eundem Mag. Matheum in archiepiscopum & pastorem ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, cæteraque omnia & singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac parte incumbunt officio pastoralis, juxta formam statutorum in ea parte editorum & provisorum, velitis cum effectu. In cujus rei testimonium, &c. Teste reginâ apud Redgrave, nono die septembris. Per breve de privato sigillo.

II. *Queen Elizabeth's second Letters Patents to proceed to the Confirmation and Consecration of Parker.*

AS the first Letters Patents had no effect, the Queen granted others the sixth of *December*, in which she added a clause, which begins with these words, *Supplentes nihilominus, &c.* which has been made an argument against the validity of the *English* Ordinations; but the more learned canonists of *England* have made no difficulty of it. See here their opinion upon it.

WE whose names that are here under subscribed, think in our judgments, that by this commission in this form penned, as well the Queen's Majesty may lawfully authorize the persons within named to the effect specified, as that the said persons

# 346 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

sons may exercise the act of confirming and consecrating, in the same to them committed.

|                      |                             |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>William May,</i>  | <i>Henry Harvey,</i>        |
| <i>Rob. Weston,</i>  | <i>Thomas Yale,</i>         |
| <i>Edward Leeds,</i> | <i>Nicholas Bullingham.</i> |

**R** Egina, &c. Reverendis in Christo patribus, Antonio Landav. episcopo, Willielmo Barloo quondam Bathon. episcopo, nunc Cicestr. electo, Johanni Scorye quondam Cicestr. episcopo, nunc Herefordensi, Mil. Coverdall quondam Exoniensi episcopo, Ricardo Bedfordensi, Johanni Thetfordensi episcopis suffraganeis, Johanni Bale Offerensi episcopo, salutem.

Cum, vacante nuper sede archiepiscopali Cantuariensi per mortem naturalem D. Reginaldi Pole cardinalis, ultimi & immediati archiepiscopi & pastoris ejusdem, ad humilem petitionem decani & capituli ecclesiæ nostræ cathedralis & metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariensis, eisdem per literas nostras patentes licentiam concesserimus alium sibi eligendi in archiepiscopum & pastorem sedis prædictæ, ac iidem decanus & capitulum vigore & obtentu licentiæ nostræ prædictæ, dilectum nobis in Christo Mag. Matheum Parker S. Theologiæ professorem, sibi & ecclesiæ prædictæ elegerint in archiepiscopum & pastorem, prout per literas suas patentes sigillo eorum communis sigillatas, nobis inde directas, plenius liquet & apparet.

Nos, electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni regium nostrum assensum adhibuimus pariter & favorem, & hoc vobis tenore præsentium significamus.

Rogantes, ac in fide & dilectione, quibus nobis tenemini, firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenus vos aut ad minùs quatuor vestrum, eundem Math. Parker in archiepiscopum & pastorem ecclesiæ cathedralis & metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariensis prædictæ, sic, ut præfertur, electum, electionemque prædictam

dictam confirmare, & eundem Mag. Math. Parker in archiepiscopum & pastorem ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, cæteraque omnia & singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac parte incumbunt officio pastoralis, juxta formam statutorum in ea parte editorum & provisorum, velitis cum effectu.

Supplentes nihilominus supremâ auctoritate nostrâ Regiâ, ex mero motu ac certa scientia nostris, si quid aut in hiis quæ juxta mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fient, aut in vobis, aut in vestrum aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate vestris ad præmissa perficienda desit aut deerit eorum, quæ per statuta hujus regni, aut per leges ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur, aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione, & rerum necessitate id postulante. In cujus rei, &c. Teste Regina apud Westmonasterium vi die Decembris.

*III. The Confirmation of Parker's election by the consecrating Bishops.*

**I**N Dei nomine, Amen. Nos Willielmus quondam Bathon. & Wellen. episcopus, nunc electus Cicestr. episcopus, Johan. Scory quondam Cicestr. episcopus, nunc Herefordensis electus, Milo Coverdale quondam Exon. episcopus, & Johannes Bedfordensis episcopus, Seren. in Christo Principis & Dominæ nostræ D. Elizabethæ Dei Gratiâ, Angliæ, Franciæ & Hiberniæ Reginæ, fidei defensatricis, &c. mediantibus literis suis regiis commissionalibus patent. ad infra scripta commissarii, cum hac clausula, videlicet (unâ cum DD. Johan. Thetfordensi suffraganeo, & Joh. Bale Offerensi episcopo) & etiam hac clausula (quatenus vos aut ad minus quatuor vestrum, &c.) necnon & hac adjectione (supplentes nihilominus, &c.) specialiter & legitimè deputati in negotio confirmationis electionis de persona venerabilis & eximii viri Mag. Math. Parker, S. Theolog. professoris, in archiepiscopum Cantuariensem electi, factæ & celebratæ ritè & legitimè procedentes, omnes & singulos oppositores qui con-



### 348 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

tra dictam electionem seu formam ejusdem, aut personam electam dicere, excipere, vel opponere voluerint, ad comparandum coram nobis, istis die, horis, & loco, (si sua putaverint interesse) contra dictam electionem, formam ejusdem, aut personam electam in debita juris forma dictur' exceptur' & propositur' legitimè & peremptoriè citatos sæpiùs, publicè præconizatos, diuque & sufficienter expectatos, & nullo modo comparentes, nec contra dictam electionem, formam ejusdem, aut personam electam aliquid dicentes, excipientes, vel opposcentes, ad petitionem procuratoris, decani & capituli Cantuariensis, pronunciamus contumaces, & in pœnam contumaciarum suarum hujusmodi decernimus procedendum fore ad prolationem sententiæ five decreti finalis in hac causa ferendi ipsorum sic citatorum & non comparentium contumac' in aliquo non obstante——

**I**N Dei nomine, Amen. Auditis, visis & intellectis, ac plenariè & maturè discussis per nos Will. quondam Bath. & Well. episcopum nunc Cicestrensem electum, Joh. Scorye quondam Cicestr. episcopum, nunc electum Hereford. Milonem Coverdale quondam Exoniens. episcopum, & Johan. Bedford. episcopum, Seren. in Christo Principis & Dom. nostræ D. Elizabethæ Dei Gratiâ Angl. Franc. & Hibern. Reginæ, fidei defens. &c. mediantibus literis suis regiis commissionalibus patentibus ad infra scripta commissarios, cum hac clausula, videlicet (una cum DD. Joh. Thetfordensi suffraganeo, & Joh. Bale Offerensi episc.) & etiam hac clausula (Quatenus vos, aut ad minus quatuor vestrûm, &c.) necnon & hac adjectione (Supplentes nihilominus, &c.) specialiter & legitimè deputatos, meritis & circumstantiis cujusdam causæ five negotii confirmationis electionis de persona vener. & eximii viri Mag. Math. Parker, S. Theologiæ professoris in Archiepisc. & pastorem ecclesiæ cathedralis & metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariensis, per obitum bonæ memoriæ D. Regin. Pole ultimi

timi archiepiscopi ibidem, vacantis, electi, factæ & celebratæ, quod coram nobis aliquandiu vertebatur, & in præsentì vertitur & pendet indeciss', rimato primitus per nos toto & integro processu coram nobis in dicto negotio habito & facto, atque diligenter recensito, servatisque per nos de jure & statutis hujus regni servandis, ad nostri decreti finalis sive sententiæ diffinitivæ confirmationis in hujusmodi negotio ferendæ prolationem, sic duximus procedendum, & procedimus in hunc qui sequitur modum: Quia per acta exhibita, producta & probata coram nobis in hujusmodi confirmationis negotio, comperimus, & luculenter invenimus electionem ipsam per decanum & capitulum ecclesiæ cathedralis & metropoliticæ Christi Cantuar. prædictæ de præfato vener. & eximio viro Mag. Math. Parker electo hujusmodi, viro utique provido & discreto, vitâ & moribus meritò commendato, libero & de legitimo matrimonio procreato, atque in ætate legitima & ordine sacerdotali constituto, ritè & legitime fuisse & esse factam & celebratam, nihilque eidem ven. viro Mag. Math. Parker electo hujusmodi, de ecclesiasticis institutis obviaffe, seu obviare, quo minùs in archiep. Cantuar. autoritate dictæ Ill. D. N. Regin. meritò debeat confirmari. Idcirco nos Will. nuper Bath. & Well. episcopus, nunc Cicestriensis electus, Johannes Scory quondam Cicestriensis episcopus, nunc electus Herefordiensis, Milo Coverdale quondam Exoniensis episc. & Johan. Bedford. episcopus, commissarii regii antedicti, attentis præmissis, & aliis virtut' merit', super quibus præfatus electus Cantuariensis fide digno commendatur testimonio, Christi nomine primitus invocato, ac ipsum solum Deum oculis nostris præponendo, de & cum consilio jurisperitorum, cum quibus in hac parte communicavimus, prædictam electionem de eodem vener. viro Mag. Math. Parker (ut præfertur) factam & celebratam, suprema autoritate dictæ Ser. D. N. Reginæ nobis in hac parte commissâ, confirmamus; suppletes ex suprema autoritate regia, ex mero principis

### 350 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

cipis motu, ac certa scientia nobis delegata, quidquid in hac electione fuerit defectum, tum in hiis quæ juxta mandatum nobis creditum, à nobis factum & processum est, aut in nobis, aut aliquorum nostrorum conditione, statu, facultate ad hæc perficienda deest aut deerit; tum etiam eorum quæ per statuta hujus Regni Angliæ, aut per leges ecclesiasticas, in hac parte requisita sunt vel necessaria, prout temporis ratio & rerum præsentium necessitas id postulant, per hanc nostram sententiam diffinitivam, sive hoc nostrum finale decretum, quam, sive quod, ad petitionem partium ita petentium fecimus, & promulgamus in his scriptis.

#### IV. *The Record of Parker's Consecration taken out of the registers of the Church of Canterbury, and out of Corpus Christi College library at Cambridge.*

Rituum atque cæremoniarum ordo in consecrando RR. in Chr. patre Matth. Parker, archiepisc. Cant. in Sacello suo apud manerium suum de Lambeth, die Dominico, 17, viz. die mensis Decembris, Ann. Dom. 1559, habit'.

**P**Rincipio sacellum tapetibus ad orientem adornabatur, solum verò panno rubro insternebatur; mensaque quoque sacris peragendis necessaria, tapeto pulvinarique ornata ad orientem sita erat.

Quatuor præterea cathedræ, quatuor episcopis quibus munus consecrandi archiepiscopi delegabatur, ad Austrum Orientalis sacelli partis erant positæ.

Scamnum præterea tapeto pulvinaribusque instratum, cui episcopi genibus flexis inniterentur, ante cathedras ponebatur.

Pari quoque modo cathedra scamnumque tapeto pulvinarique ornatum archiepiscopo, ad Borealem orientalis ejusdem sacelli partis plagam posita erant.

His rebus ita ordine suo instructis, manè circiter quintam aut sextam per occidentalem portam ingredi-

tur



tur facellum archiepiscopus togâ talari coccineâ caputioque indutus, quatuor præcedentibus funalibus, & quatuor comitatus episcopis, qui ejus consecrationi inservirent (verbi gratiâ) Guill. Barlow olim Bath. & Well. episcopo, nunc <sup>a</sup> verò ad Cicestr. episcopatum electo, Joh. Scory olim Cichestr. episcopo, & nunc <sup>b</sup> ad Hereford. vocato, Milone Coverdallo olim Exon. episcopo, & Joh. <sup>c</sup> Hodgskinne Bedfordiæ suffraganeo. Qui omnes postquam sedes sibi paratas ordine singuli suo occupassent, preces continuò matutinæ per Andream Pierfon archiepiscopi capellân timer clara voce recitabantur: quibus peractis, Joh. Scory (de quo supra diximus) suggestum conscendit, atque inde assumpto sibi in thema, *Seniores ergo qui in vobis sunt obsecro consenior*, &c. non ineleganter concionabatur.

Finita concione, egrediuntur simul archiepiscopus reliquique quatuor episcopi facellum, se ad sacram communionem paraturi: Neque mora, confestim per borealem portam <sup>d</sup> in vestiarium, ad hunc modum vestiti redeunt; archiepiscopus nimirum linteo superpelliceo (quod vocant) induebatur. Cicestrensis electus capâ sericâ ad sacra peragenda paratus utebatur: Cui ministrabant operamque suam præbebant duo archiepiscopi Capellani, viz. Nicholas Bullingham Lincolnæ <sup>e</sup> archidiaconus, & Edmundus Gest Cantuariensis <sup>f</sup> quoque archidiaconus, capis sericis similiter vestiti. Hereford. electus, & Bedfordiensis suffraganeus linteis superpelliceis induebantur.

Milo verò Coverdallus nonnisi togâ laneâ talari utebatur.

Atque hunc in modum vestiti & instructi ad communionem celebrandam perrexerunt, archiepiscopo genubus flexis ad infimum facelli gradum sedente.

<sup>a</sup> Exemplar Cantuariense, nunc electo Cicestrensi.

<sup>b</sup> Cant. nunc Hereford. electo. <sup>c</sup> In Cant. deest Hodgskinne.

<sup>d</sup> Fortè ingressi in vestiarium. In exempl. eccl. Cant. deest in vestiarium.

<sup>e</sup> In Ex. Cant. deest archidiaconus. <sup>f</sup> Cant. respectivè archidiaconi.

# 352 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

Finito tandem evangelio, Hereford. electus, Bedfordiæ suffraganeus, & Milo Coverdallus (de quibus supra) archiepiscopum coram Ciceſtrenſi electo apud menſam in cathedra & ſedenti, his verbis adduxerunt. “Rev. in Deo Pater, hunc virum pium pariter atque doctum tibi offerimus atque præſentamus, ut archiepiscopus conſecretur.” Poſtquam hæc<sup>h</sup> dixiſſent, proferebatur illicò reginæ diploma ſive mandatum pro conſecratione archiepiscopi, quo per rev. Thomam Yale legum doctorem perlecto, ſacramentum de regio primatu ſive ſuprema ejus authoritate tuenda juxta ſtatuta primo anno regni Seren. Reginæ noſtræ Elizabeth<sup>i</sup> promulgata, ab eodem archiepiscopo exigebatur, quod cum ille ſolenniter tactis corporaliter ſacris evangeliis, conceptis verbis præſtitiffet, Ciceſtrenſis electus<sup>k</sup> quædam præſatus, atque populum ad orationem hortatus, ad litanias decantandas choro reſpondente ſe accinxit. Quibus finitis, poſt quæſtiones aliquot archiepiscopo per Ciceſtr. electum propoſitas, & poſt orationes & ſuffragia quædam juxta formam libri<sup>l</sup> antedicti parlamenti editi apud Deum habita, Ciceſtrienſis, Herefordienſis, ſuffraganeus Bedfordienſis, & Milo Coverdallus, manibus archiepiscopo impoſitis<sup>m</sup>: “Accipe (inquiunt Anglicè) Spiritum Sanctum, & gratiam Dei quæ jam per<sup>n</sup> impoſitionem manuum in te eſt, excitare memento. Non enim timoris ſed virtutis, dilectionis & ſobrietatis ſpiritum dedit nobis Deus.” His ita dictis, biblia ſacra illi in manibus tradiderunt, hujusmodi apud eum verba habentes: “<sup>o</sup> In legendo, hortando & docendo vide diligens ſis, atque ea meditare aſſiduè quæ in hiſce libris ſcripta ſunt: noli in his ſegnibus eſſe, quo incrementum inde proveniens omnibus innotefcat, & palàm fiat. Cura quæ ad te & ad docendi munus ſpectant dili-

<sup>g</sup> Ex. Cant. *ſedente.*      <sup>h</sup> Cant. *dixiſſet.*      <sup>i</sup> Cant. *edita & prom.*      <sup>k</sup> In Cant. deſunt hæc verba *quad. præſatus atque.*  
<sup>l</sup> Melius Cant. *authoritate Parl.*      <sup>m</sup> In Ex. Cant. hæc formula Anglicè legitur.      <sup>n</sup> Malè leg. *impoſitionis.*      <sup>o</sup> In Ex. Cant. hæc formula Anglicè legitur.

“ genter:

“genter: hoc enim modo non teipsum solum, sed & “reliquos auditores tuos per Jesum Christ. Dom. no- “strum salvabis.” Postquam hæc dixissent, ad reliqua communionis solemnities pergit Cicestrensis, nullum archiepiscopo tradens pastorale baculum: cum quo communicabant <sup>p</sup> unà archiepiscopus, & illi episcopi supra nominati; cum aliis etiam nonnullis.

Finitis tandem peractisque sacris, egreditur per bo- realem <sup>q</sup> Orientis sacelli partis portam archiepiscopus, quatuor illis comitatus episcopis, qui eum consecrave- rant, & confestim iisdem ipsis stipatus episcopis, per eandem revertitur portam albo episcopali superpelli- tio, crimeraque (ut vocant) ex nigro serico indutus, circa collum verò collare quoddam ex pretiosis pelli- bus Sabellinis (vulgo **Sables** vocant) consutum gesta- bat. Pari quoque modo Cicestrensis & Hereford. su- is episcopalibus amictibus, superpellitio <sup>r</sup> scilicet & & crimerâ uterque induebatur. D. Coverdallus verò & Bedfordiæ suffraganeus togis solummodò talaribus utebantur. Pergens deinde occidentalem portam ver- sus archiepiscopus, Thomæ Doyle œconomo, Johan- ni Baker thesaurario, & Johan. Marche computo ro- tulario, singulis singulos albos dedit baculos; hoc sci- licet modo <sup>f</sup> eis muneribus & officiis suis ornans.

Hiis itaque hunc ad modum ordine suo, ut jam an- te dictum est, peractis, per occidentalem portam sa- cellum egreditur archiepiscopus, generosioribus qui- busque sanguine <sup>t</sup> ex ejus familia eum præcedentibus, reliquis verò eum à tergo sequentibus.

Acta gestaque hæc erant omnia in præsentia reve- rend. <sup>v</sup> episcoporum Edmundi Gryndall Lond. epis- copi electi, Ricardi Cockes Eliensis electi, Edwini Sandes Wigorn. electi, Anthonii Huse armigeri prin- cipalis & primarii registrarii dicti archiepiscopi, Tho- mæ Argall armigeri registrarii <sup>x</sup> Cicestriæ prærogativæ

<sup>p</sup> In Cant. deest unà.

<sup>q</sup> Melius Cant. *orientalis*.

<sup>r</sup> In

Cant. deest *scilicet*.

<sup>f</sup> Melius Cant. *eos*.

<sup>t</sup> Cant. *et*.

<sup>v</sup> Cant. in Christo patrum deest *episcoporum*.

<sup>x</sup> Melius

Cant. *curia*.



# 354 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

Cantuariensis, Thomæ Willet & Joh. Incent notario-  
rum publicorum, & aliorum y quoque nonnullorum.

Concordat cum originali in bibliotheca Collegii  
Corporis Christi apud Cantabrigienses.

Jan. 8.  
1674.

Ita testor Matth. Whinn, Notarius  
Public. & Acad. Cant. Registra-  
rius Principalis.

## *Another Certificate.*

*Camb. Jan. 11. 1674.*

**W**E whose names are hereunto subscribed, hav-  
ing seen the original, whereof this writing is  
a perfect copy, and considered the hand, and other  
circumstances thereof, are fully persuaded, that it is  
a true and genuine record of the Rites and Ceremo-  
nies of Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration, and as an-  
cient as the date it bears. In witness whereof we  
have hereunto set our hands, the day and year above  
written.

*Hen. Paman, Orat. Publ.*

*Hen. More, D. D.*

*Ra. Widdrington, S.T.D. & D. Marg.P.*

*V. A copy of a Certificate sent to attest the records in  
Bramhall's Works, among which is found the record  
of Parker's Consecration, and whereof I have deposi-  
ted the Original in the King's Library [at Paris]  
the ninth of May, 1722.*

**W**E whose names are subscribed do certify, that  
we have collated and compared together the  
Records of the R. R. *Matthew Parker's* Consecration  
printed in a Book entituled, *The Works of the most  
Rev. Father in God John Bramhall, D. D. late Lord  
Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of*

y In Cant. deest quoque.

*proving the FACTS Asserted.* 355

all Ireland, printed at Dublin in the year 1677, in Fol. which Records, excepting some passages hereafter mentioned, we have found very conformable to the original, which is preserv'd in the Archives of the archiepiscopal Palace at *Lambeth* near *London*.

Pag. 1025. lin. 8. Registrum legit: *consecrandum & benedicendum fore.*

Pag. 1028. lin. 46. Registrum legit: *directis.*

Pag. 1029. lin. 24. Registrum legit: *opponere.*

Pag. 1033. lin. 29. Registrum legit: *semel tantum in omnibus.*

Pag. 1034. lin. 29. Registrum legit: *quo quidem die Martis, viz.*

Pag. 1036. lin. 30. Registrum legit: *quod comparerent & eorum.*

Pag. 1038. lin. 10. Registrum legit: *jus & potestas.*

Pag. 1039. lin. 29. Registrum omittit: *eligendi.*

Pag. 1042. lin. 24. Registrum legit: *ad octavum dicit in vim.*

Pag. 1044. lin. 10. Registrum legit: *Regni Angliæ.*

Ibid. lin. 19. Registrum legit: *merito pro meris.*

Ibid. lin. 44. Registrum legit: *rerum præsentium.*

Ibid. lin. 47. Registrum legit: *ferimus pro fecimus.*

Pag. 1046. lin. 28. Registrum legit: *& quatuor illi.*

*Dated at the Archiepiscopal Palace at Lambeth this 15<sup>th</sup> of March, O. S. 172 $\frac{1}{2}$ .*

Sign'd in the presence of

*W. Ayerst, S. T. B. & E. A. Pr.*

*James Piers, J. C.*

*Pat. Piers de Girardin, Dr. of the Sorbonne.*

*D. Wilkins, S. T. P. Rev. in Christo Patri Guil. Archiep. Cant. à Sacris Dom.*

N<sup>o</sup>. VI.Attestations against the Fable of *Parker's* Consecration at the *Nagshhead*.I. *The Attestation of the Bishop of Durham.*

**W**Hereas I am most injuriously and slanderously traduced by a nameless author, calling himself *N. N.* in a Book said to be printed at *Rouen* 1657, entituled (*A Treatise of the nature of Catholick Faith and Heresie*) as if upon the presenting of a certain Book in the Upper House, in the beginning of the late Parliament, proving, as he saith, the Protestant Bishops had no Succession, nor Consecration, and therefore no Bishops, and by consequence ought not to sit in Parliament, I should make a speech against the said Book in my own and all the Bishops behalf, endeavouring to prove Succession from the late Catholick Bishops (as he there styles them) who by imposition of hands ordained the first Protestant Bishops at the *Nagshhead* in *Cheapside*, as was notorious to all the world, &c.

I do hereby in the presence of Almighty God, solemnly protest and declare to all the world, that what this author there affirms concerning me is a most notorious untruth, and a gross slander; for to the best of my knowledge and remembrance, no such Book as he there mentions was ever presented to the Upper House in that or any other Parliament that ever I sate in; and if there had, I could never have made such a speech, as is there pretended, seeing I have ever spoken according to my thoughts, and always believed that Fable of the *Nagshhead* Consecration to have proceeded from the father of lyes, as the authentick records of the Church still extant, which were so faithfully transcribed, and published by Mr. *Mason*, do evidently testifie. And whereas the same impudent



dent libeller doth moreover say, that what he there affirms was told to many, by one of the ancientest Peers of *England* present in Parliament, when I made this pretended speech, and that he is ready to depose the same upon his oath, and that he cannot believe any will be so impudent to deny a thing so notorious, whereof there are as many witnesses living, as there are Lords and Bishops that were that day in the Upper House of Parliament, &c. I answer, that I am very unwilling to believe any Peer of *England* should have so little sense of his conscience and honour, as either to swear, or so much as affirm such a notorious untruth. And therefore for the justification of my self, and manifestation of the truth in this particular, I do freely and willingly appeal (as he directs me) to those many honourable persons, the Lords spiritual and temporal yet alive, who sate in the house of Peers in that Parliament, or to as many of them as this my protestation shall come to, for a true certificate of what they know or believe concerning this matter; humbly desiring them, and charging it upon their souls, as they will answer it to God at the day of Judgment, that they will be pleased to testify the truth, and nothing but the truth herein, to the best of their knowledge and remembrance, without any favour or affection to me at all. I cannot reasonably be suspected by any indifferent man, of denying any thing that I know or believe to be true, seeing I am so shortly, in all probability, to render an account to the Searcher of hearts, of all my words and actions, being now (at the least) upon the ninety fifth year of my age. And I acknowledge it a great mercy and favour of God, that he hath reserved me thus long, to clear the Church of *England* and my self of this most notorious slander, before he takes me to himself. For I cannot imagine any reason why this shameless writer might not have cast the same upon any of my reverend brethren as well as me, but only that I being the eldest, it was probable

# 358 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

I might be in my grave before this untruth could be taken notice of in the world. And now I thank God God I can chearfully sing my *Nunc dimittis*, unless it please him to reserve me for the like service hereafter; for I desire not to live any longer upon earth, than he shall be pleased to make me his instrument to defend the truth, and promote his glory. And for the more solemn and full confirmation of this my free and voluntary protestation and declaration, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this seventeenth day of *July, Ann. Dom. 1658.*

*Thomas Duresme.*

Signed, sealed, published, and declared in the presence of

|                             |                     |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Tho. Sanders, sen.</i>   | <i>R. Gray,</i>     |
| <i>Tho. Sanders, jun.</i>   | <i>Evan Davies.</i> |
| <i>John Barwick, Clerk.</i> |                     |

**I** *Tobias Holder*, Publick Notary, being requested by the Right Reverend Father in God *Thomas Lord Bishop of Duresme*, at the house of *Tho. Sanders Esq;* in the Parish of *Flamstead* in the County of *Hartford*, in the year of our Lord, month and day above specified, was then and there personally present, where and when the said reverend Bishop did sign, publish and declare this his protestation and declaration above written to be his act and deed, and did cause his authentick episcopal seal to be thereto affixed in the presence of the witnesses, whose names are thereto subscribed: And did there and then likewise sign, publish and declare as his act and deed, another of the same tenor written in paper, which he signed with his manual seal, in the presence of the same witnesses. All this I heard, saw, and therefore know to be done. In testimony whereof I have subscribed, and thereto put my usual and accustomed Notaries sign.

*Tobias Holder*, Publick Notary.  
II. *The*

II. *The Certificate of some other Bishops.*

**W**Hereas we the surviving Bishops of the Church of *England* who sat in the Parliament begun at *Westminster* the third of *November* 1640, were required by our reverend brother the Lord Bishop of *Duresme*, to declare and attest the truth, concerning an imputation cast upon him in the pamphlet of that nameless author mentioned in his protestation and declaration here prefixed. And whereas we are obliged to perform what he requesteth, both for the justification of the truth, and for the clearing of our selves of another slanderous aspersion, which the same author casteth upon us, as if we had heard our said reverend brother make such a speech, as is there pretended, and by our silence had approved what that libeller falsely affirmeth was delivered in it. We do hereby solemnly protest and declare before God and all the world, that we never knew of any such Book presented to the House of Peers, as he there pretendeth, nor believe any such was ever presented; and therefore could never hear any such speech made against it, as he mentioneth by our said reverend brother or any other, much less approve of it by our silence. And if any such Book had been presented, or any such speech had been made, there is none among us so ignorant or negligent of his duty in defending the truth, but would have been both able, and ready to have confuted so groundless a Fable, as the pretended Consecration of Bishops at the *Nagsh-head*, out of the authentick and known registers of the Church still extant, mentioned and faithfully transcribed and published by Mr. *Mason* so long before. For the confirmation of which truth, and attestation of what our said reverend brother hath herewith protested and declared, we have hereunto set



# 360 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

our hands. Dated the nineteenth day of *July, An. Dom. 1658.*

*London, M. Ely, Jo. Roffens.  
Br. Sarum, Oxford.  
Bath and Wells,*

## III. *Another Certificate of some Peers.*

**W**E of the Lords temporal, whose names are here underwritten, who sat in the Parliament begun at *Westminster* the third day of *November 1640*, being desired by the Bishop of *Duresm* to testify our knowledge concerning an imputation cast upon him, about a speech pretended to be made by him in that Parliament, more particularly mentioned and disavowed in his prefixed protestation, do hereby testify and declare, that to the best of our present knowledge and remembrance, no such book against Bishops, as is there mention'd, was presented to the house of Peers in that Parliament. And consequently, that no such speech as is there pretended, was or could be made by him or any other against it. In testimony whereof we have signed this our attestation with our own hands. Dated the nineteenth day of *July, An. Dom. 1658.*

|                    |                     |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Dorchester,</i> | <i>Lindsey.</i>     |
| <i>Rutland,</i>    | <i>Southampton.</i> |
| <i>Lincoln,</i>    | <i>Devonshire.</i>  |
| <i>Cliveland,</i>  | <i>Monmouth.</i>    |
| <i>Dover,</i>      |                     |

## IV. *Another certificate of the Clerk of the Parliament.*

**U**PON search made in the book of the Lords house, I do not find any such book presented, nor any entry of any such speech made by Bishop *Morton.*

*Henry Scobel* Clerk of the Parliament.

Nº. VII.

*Records concerning Barlow.*

Since *Barlow* makes almost as great a figure in this dissertation as *Parker*, and as it is upon the Ordination of the first, that that of the other does in great measure depend, I have thought it necessary to join to the preceding proofs, those that relate to *Barlow*, to leave nothing wanting in a matter so important. Some extracts out of a letter which a learned *English* Bishop some time ago writ to me, and which I have plac'd at the end of these proofs, may serve to supply some pieces that I wanted, and fortify the truth with yet more convincing reasons than I have produced in justification of *Barlow's* consecration.

I. *A commission to consecrate Barlow of the 22<sup>d</sup> of Feb. 1535.*

REX<sup>z</sup> reverendissimo in Christo patri Thomæ Cantuariensi archiepiscopo, totius Angliæ primati, salutem. Sciatis quod electioni nuper factæ in ecclesia cathedrali Assavensi per mortem bonæ memoriæ Dom. Henrici Standishe ultimi episcopi ibidem, vacante, de venerabili & religioso viro Dom. Willielmo Barlowe priore domûs sive prioratûs de Bisham ordinis S. Augustini Sarum diœcesis in episcopum loci illius & pastorem, regium assensum adhibuimus & favorem: Et hoc vobis tenore præsentium significamus, ut quod vestrûm est in hac parte exequamini. In cujus, &c. Teste rege, apud Westmonasterium 22 die Februarii.

<sup>z</sup> Rymer, t. 14. pag. 559.

II. *The*

## 362 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

### II. *The restitution of the temporalities of the Bishoprick of St. David's, of the 26<sup>th</sup> of April, 1536.*

**H**Enricus<sup>a</sup> VIII, &c. Sciatis quòd, cum cathedralis ecclesia Menevensis per mortem Richardi Rawlins nuper episcopi Menev. nuper viduata, ac pastoralis solatio fuerit destituta, & vacaverit, eo prætextu omnes exitus, & proficua, firmæ, redditus, reversiones, cum commoditatibus & emolumentis temporalium episcopatus illius à tempore mortis prædicti nuper episcopi, durante tempore vacationis episcopatus illius, nobis jure prærogativæ nostræ regię pertinerunt & spectaverunt, ac pertinere & spectare dignoscuntur; quumque præcentor & capitulum dictæ cathedralis ecclesiæ post mortem prædicti episcopi, licentiâ nostrâ inde prius obtentâ, dilectum & fidelem nostrum Willielmum Barlow, nunc dictæ ecclesiæ cathedralis Menevensis per nos nominatum, episcopum, in suum elegerunt episcopum & pastorem, reverendiss. in Chr. pater Thomas archiep. Cantuar. electionem illam acceptaverit & confirmaverit, ipsumque sic electum episcopum prædictæ ecclesiæ Menevensis præfecit & pastorem, sicut per literas patentes ipsius archiepiscopi inde directas nobis constat. Nos nunc certis de causis & considerationibus nos specialiter moventibus, & ob sinceram dilectionem quam penes præfatum nunc episcopum gerimus & habemus, de gratia nostra speciali, ac ex certa scientia & mero motu nostris, dedimus & concessimus, ac per præsentem damus & concedimus pro nobis, hæredibus & successoribus nostris, quantum in nobis est, eidem nunc episcopo omnia & singula, exitus, firmas, redditus, proficua, reversiones, advantagia, commoditates, feoda & alia emolumenta quæcumque, cum omnibus & singulis suis pertinentiis & dependentiis omnium & singulorum honorum, castrorum, &c. In

<sup>a</sup> *Mason de Ministr. Anglic. lib. 3. cap. 10. pag. 365.*



cujus rei testimonium, &c. Teste rege, 26 die Aprilis, &c.

III. *The parliamentary writ for the Year 1536.*

**R**EX, <sup>b</sup> &c. Teste rege apud Westmonasterium 27 die Aprilis anno regni sui vicesimo octavo....<sup>c</sup> episcopo Bangorensi. T<sup>e</sup> Episcopo Menevensi. Custodi spiritualitatis episcopatus Wintoniensis, ipso episcopo in remotis agente, &c.

IV. *The parliamentary writ in the Year 1541, where Barlow is nam'd before several Bishops certainly consecrated.*

**R**EX, <sup>d</sup> &c. Teste rege apud Westmonasterium vicesimo tertio die Novembris anno regni sui tricesimo tertio. Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi . . . . . episcopo Menevensi, W. episcopo Norwicensi, R. episcopo Landavensi, J. episcopo Herefordensi, &c.

V. *A Conge d'Eslire for a Bishop to the See of St. Asaph, after the translation of Bishop Barlow, dated May 29, 1536.*

**R**EX, <sup>e</sup> &c. Dilectis sibi in Christo decano & capitulo ecclesiæ nostræ cathedralis Aslavenfis, salutem.

Ex patre vestra nobis est humiliter supplicatum, ut cum ecclesia nostra prædicta per liberam transmutationem Willielmi Barlowe ultimi episcopi ibidem electi, sit pastoris solatio destituta, alium vobis eligendi in episcopum & pastorem licentiam concedere dignaremur. Nos precibus vestris in hac parte favorabiliter inclinati, licentiam illam vobis tenore præsentium duximus concedendam; mandantes quòd talem

<sup>b</sup> Selon les loix d'Angleterre, les convocations ne s'adressent qu' aux évêques consacrez.

<sup>c</sup> Rymer, t. 14. pag. 563.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. pag. 737.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. pag. 570.

# 364 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

vobis eligatis in episcopum & pastorem qui Deo devotus, ecclesiæ vestræ necessarius, nobisque & regno nostro utilis & fidelis existat. In cujus, &c. Teste rege, apud Westmonasterium 29 die Maii. Per breve de privato sigillo.

## VI. *A commission to consecrate Robert Warton Bishop of St. Asaph, dated the 24<sup>th</sup> of June, 1536.*

**R**EX<sup>f</sup> reverendissimo in Chr. patri Thomæ eadem gratia archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, totius Angliæ primati & metropolitano, salutem.

Cum, nuper vacante sede episcopali Assavensi per litteram transmutationem Willielmi Barlowe, ultimi episcopi ibidem electi, ad humilem supplicationem dilectorum nobis in Chr. decani & capituli ecclesiæ nostræ cathedralis Assavensis, eisdem per literas nostras patentes licentiam concesserimus alium sibi eligendi in episcopum loci prædicti & pastorem: ac iidem decanus & capitulum prætextu licentiæ nostræ prædictæ dilectum nobis in Christo Rob. Warton abbatem exempti monasterii S. Salvatoris de Bermondeseye sibi eligerint in episcopum & pastorem.... Nos electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni regium assensum nostrum adhibuimus & favorem... Rogantes, &c. Teste rege, apud Westmonasterium, 24 die Junii. Per breve de privato sigillo.

We might have added here *Cranmer's* commission, directed in 154 $\frac{1}{2}$  to *John* Bishop of *Salisbury*, *William* (*Barlow*) Bishop of *St. David's*, and *John* Bishop of *Glocester*, for the consecration of *Arthur Buckley*; but as it is to be met with, for the most part among the fragments of the letters at the end of these proofs, it is sufficient here to mention it only.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid.

VII. *A writ of nomination to the Bishoprick of Bath,  
the 26<sup>th</sup> of February, 1547.*

**W**E have inserted this record intire, because it is the first of this kind publish'd in *Rymer's* collection, by which it appears, that the King had assum'd to himself the nomination of Bishops, in taking away from the Chapters the right of election.

**R**EX omnibus ad quos, &c. salutem. Cum per quendam actum in parlamento nostro inchoato apud Westmonasterium 4 die Novembris anno regni nostri primo, ac ibidem tento, inter alia statuta pro republica nostra edita ordinatum, enactum & stabilitum fuerit quòd nullum breve de licentia eligendi (vulgariter vocatum *Conge d'Eslier*) deinceps concessum foret, nec electio alicujus archiepiscopi seu episcopi per decanum & capitulum fieret; sed quòd nos per literas nostras patentes, quolibet tempore, cum aliquis archiepiscopatus seu episcopatus vacaret, alicui personæ quam nos idoneam existimaremus, eundem conferre possemus & valeamus; & eadem collatio sic per literas nostras patentes hujusmodi personæ factas & deliberatas, cui nos in eundem conferremus archiepiscopatum seu episcopatum, seu ejus sufficienti procuratori vel attornato, stare & foret ad omnia intentiones, constructiones & proposita, tanti & consimilis effectûs quanti & qualis foret sive breve de licentia eligendi concessum, electio rite facta & eadem confirmata fuissent; & quòd post hujusmodi collationem, eadem persona, cui hujusmodi archiepiscopatus seu episcopatus foret collatus seu datus, posset consecrari, & habere liberationem suam, seu breve de Amoveas manum, ac omnia alia agere prout eadem ceremoniæ & electiones fuissent factæ & actæ, prout in eodem statuto plenius liquet.



## 366 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

Ac cum episcopus Bath. & Well. hoc tempore sit vacuus, suoque idoneo pastore destitutus, morte rev. patris piæ memoriæ Willielmi nuper illius loci episcopi, & ob id ad munus nostrum regium pertinere dinoscatur alium in ejus locum surrogandum, qui ob eximias animi dotes populum nostrum illius diocesis latè patentis, juxta D. Pauli normam dignè pascat.

Sciatis quòd nos existimantes rev. patrem Willielmum Menev. episcopum ad episcopatum prædictum modò vacantem idoneum tam propter singularem sacrarum literarum doctrinam, moresque probatissimos, quibus idem rev. pater modò episcopus Menevensis præditus est, quàm propter hoc quòd juxta Salvatoris nostri elogium judicamus illum virum imprimis dignum esse, ut super multa constituatur, qui super pauca fuerat fidelis; ex gratia nostra speciali, ac ex certa scientia & mero motu nostris, necnon de avisamento & consensu præcarissimi avunculi & consilarii nostri Edwardi ducis Somersetiæ, personæ nostræ gubernatoris, ac regnorum, dominiorum subditorumque nostrorum quorumcunque protectoris, cæterorumque consiliariorum nostrorum; contulimus, dedimus, & concessimus, ac per præsentem conferimus, damus, & concedimus præfato rev. patri Willielmo nunc Menev. episcopo prædictum episcopatum Bathon. & Wellens. ac eundem Willielmum in episcopatum Bath. & Well. transferimus per præsentem, ac ipsum Willielmum episcopum Bath. & Wellens. ac diocesis Bathon. & Well. prædictæ nominamus, facimus, ordinamus, creatum, & constituimus per præsentem.

Habendum, tenendum, occupandum, & gaudendum prædictum episcopatum Bathon. & Well. eidem Willielmo, durante vita sua naturali, unà cum omnibus dominiis, maneriis, terris, tenementis, hæreditamentis, possessionibus, & juribus, tam spiritualibus quàm temporalibus, ac cum omnibus aliis proficuis, commoditatibus, emolumentis, auctoritatibus, jurisdictionibus & præeminentiis quibuscumque, eidem episcopatu Bath. & Well. quoquo modo spectantibus, pertinentibus

tibus five incumbentibus. Eò quòd expressa mentio, &c. In cujus rei, &c. Teste rege apud Westmonasterium tertio die Februarii. Per breve de privato sigillo.

In consequence of this nomination and this investiture to the Bishoprick of *Bath*, there is to be met with in this same volume of *Rymer's* a deed of Bishop *Barlow's* sign'd in Chapter, whereby he exchanges several lands belonging to his Church, for others granted him by King *Edward*. And *Mason* for his part, has publish'd two deeds of King *Edward's*, which answer to this of *Barlow's*; but as there is nothing particular in these deeds relating to the consecration of this Prelate, and that they only suppose it by the proof they give of the possession of the temporalities of the Church of *Bath*, which he enjoy'd; we have contented our selves to have mention'd them without inserting them.

VIII. *A Conge d'Eslire to the Bishoprick of Bath, vacant by the resignation of Barlow, the 13<sup>th</sup> of March, 155 $\frac{3}{4}$ .*

**R**egina, <sup>h</sup> dilectis nobis in Christo decano & capitulo ecclesiæ cathedralis Wellens. salutem. Cùm ecclesia nostra cathedralis prædicta per liberam & spontaneam resignationem in manus nostras ultimi episcopi ibidem, jam sit pastoris solatio destituta; nos alium vobis eligendi in episcopum & pastorem duximus concedendum: Mandantes quòd talem vobis eligatis in episcopum & pastorem, qui sacrarum literarum cognitione ad id munus aptus, Deo devotus, nobis & regno nostro utilis & fidelis, ecclesiæque nostræ prædictæ necessarius existat. In cujus rei, &c. Teste regina apud Westmonasterium, 13 die Martii. Per breve de privato sigillo.

<sup>h</sup> Rymer, t. 15. pag. 369.

## 368 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

IX. *A commission of Queen Mary's to consecrate the successor of Barlow in the Bishoprick of Bath, the 28<sup>th</sup> of March, 1554.*

**R**egina, <sup>1</sup> &c. Omnibus archiepiscopis, episcopis, vel aliis quibuscunque, quorum in hac parte intererit, salutem.

Vacante nuper sede episcopali infra ecclesiam nostram cathedralem Wellensem per deprivationem & amotionem ultimi episcopi ibidem (Wil. Barlow) decanus & capitulum ejusdem ecclesiæ (licentiâ prius à nobis per eos alium eligendi in eorum episcopum & pastorem petitâ pariter & obtentâ) discretum virum Magistrum Gilbertum Bourne, S. Theologiæ Bachalaureum in eorum episcopum & pastorem canonicè elegerunt & nominaverunt, sicuti per eorum literas, quas vobis mittimus præsentibus inclusas plenius liquet; vobis significamus, &c. Teste regina apud Westmonasterium, 28 die Martii. Per ipsam reginam.

A proof that no consequence can be drawn against *Barlow's* consecration from the words met with in the preceding commission, *per deprivationem & amotionem ultimi episcopi*, is, that in the writ for the temporalities of *Bath* given his successor, and after the date of this commission, it is observ'd, that the See was vacant *per liberam resignationem* of *Barlow*. It is the same *Rymer* that gives that act which we have publish'd.

X. *A writ for the temporalities of the Bishoprick of Bath, dated the 20<sup>th</sup> of April, 1554.*

**R**egina <sup>m</sup> escaetori suo in comitatu Somersetiæ, salutem.

Vacante nuper episcopatu Bathoniensi & Wellensi per liberam resignationem ultimi episcopi ibidem, de-

<sup>1</sup> Rymer, t. 15. pag. 376.

<sup>m</sup> Rymer, t. 15. pag. 384.

canus



canus & capitulum ecclesiæ cathedralis Wellensis prædictæ (licentiâ nostrâ primitus petitâ pariter & obtentâ) dilectum nobis Magistrum Gilbertum Bourne S. Theologiæ Bachalarium in eorum episcopum & pastorem elegerunt. Cui quidem electioni & personæ sic electæ regium assensum nostrum adhibuimus pariter & favorem, ipsiusque electi fidelitatem, nobis pro dicto episcopatu debitam, cepimus, ac temporalia episcopatus illius, prout moris est, restituimus eidem, habenda & percipienda eidem electo, à tempore vacationis episcopatus illius.

Et ideò tibi præcipimus, quòd eidem electo, temporalia prædicta cum pertinentiis, in Balliva tua sine dilatione liberes in forma prædicta, salvo jure cujuslibet.

Teste reginâ, apud Westmonasterium 20 die Aprilis.

This Record evidently proves, that *Barlow* had freely resign'd his Bishoprick, that he did not stay to be depos'd, and that the sentence of deposition was a thing posterior, that happen'd only by way of afterclap, to deprive that Prelate of all hopes of a return to his See.

XI. *A commission given to Parker to confirm Barlow in the See of Chichester, dated December the 18<sup>th</sup>, 1559.*

**R**EGINA, <sup>n</sup> &c. Rev. in Christo P. Dom. Matheo archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, totius Angliæ primati & metropolitano, salutem.

Cùm, vacante nuper sede episcopali Cicestrensi, per mortem Johannis Christopherson ultimi episcopi ejusdem, ad humilem petitionem decani & capituli ecclesiæ nostræ cathedralis Cicestrensis, eisdem per litteras nostras patentes licentiam concesserimus alium sibi eligendi in episcopum & pastorem sedis prædictæ,

<sup>n</sup> Pat. 14. 2. Eliz. m. 5. & Reg. Parker, fol. 24 40.

# 370 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

iidemque decanus & capitulum vigore & obrentu licentiae nostrae praedictae dilectum nobis in Christo Magistrum Willielmum Barloo S. Theologiae Professorem, ac nuper episcopum Bathonien. & Wellen. sibi & ecclesiae Cicestrensi praedictae elegerunt in episcopum & pastorem, prout per literas suas patentes, sigillo eorum communi sigillatas, nobis inde directas, plenius liquet & apparet.

Nos electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni regium nostrum assensum adhibuimus pariter & favorem, & hoc vobis tenore praesentium significamus: rogantes, ac in fide & dilectione quibus nobis tenemini, firmiter praecipiendo mandantes, quatenus eundem Magistrum Will. Barloo in episcopum & pastorem ecclesiae cathedralis Cicestrensis praedictae (sicut praefertur) electum, electionemque praedictam confirmare, caeteraque omnia & singula peragere, quae vestro in hac parte incumbunt officio pastoralis, juxta formam & effectum statutorum in ea parte editorum & provisorum, velitis cum effectu. In cujus rei, &c.

Teste reginâ, apud Westmonasterium 18 die Decembris.

*Examinatur cum recordo*

Junii 19, A. D.

1721.

per me *Robertum Sanderson.*

In the foregoing Record as publish'd by *Rymer*, after these words *electionem praedictam confirmare*, we find these words, *Et eundem Magistrum Willielmum Barloo episcopum & pastorem ecclesiae praedictae consecrare*; but these last words are neither found in the Archives of the Rolls, nor in *Parker's Register*, and it is indisputable by the proofs produc'd, that this clause was not transcrib'd by that Compiler, but printed by inadvertence and surprize, as it is attested above by Mr. *Sanderson*, and by others who have consulted the original of this Record.

XII. *A writ for the restitution of the temporalities of the Bishoprick of Chichester, granted to Barlow by Queen Elizabeth, March 28, 1560.*

**R**egina p[ro] escaetori suo in comitatu Middlesexia[rum], salutem.

Vacante nuper episcopatu Ciceſtrenſi, per mortem naturalem rev. in Chriſto P. Joh. Chriſtoferſon ultimi episcopi ibidem, decanus & capitulum ecclesiæ cathedralis Ciceſtrenſis prædictæ, licentiâ noſtrâ petitâ pariter & obtentâ, dilectum Capellanum noſtrum Will. Barlow S. Theologiæ profeſſorem, ac nuper episcopum Bathonien. & Wellen. in eorum episcopum & pastorem elegerunt.

Cui quidem electioni & personæ sic electæ regium assensum noſtrum adhibuimus pariter & favorem, ipsiusque fidelitatem nobis debitam pro dicto episcopatu recepimus, ac temporalia ejusdem episcopatus (exceptis omnibus maneriis, terris, &c.) ei restituimus per præſentes.

Et ideo tibi præcipimus, quòd præfato electo temporalia prædicta cum pertinentiis (exceptis præexceptis) in Balliva tua, unâ cum exitibus & proficuis inde provenientibus sive crescentibus, à festo S. Michaelis archangeli ultimò præterito, sine dilatione liberes, salvo jure cujuslibet.

Teste reginâ, apud Westmonasterium 18 die Martii.

This Record is a new proof of *Barlow's* consecration; for all the new Bishops having receiv'd their temporalities after their consecration, and the Queen's commission doing nothing but confirm *Barlow*, it evidently follows, that he was believ'd to be consecrated a long time before.

P Rymer, t.15. pag. 576.



## Nº. V.

*Fragments of Letters written to the Author.*

**D**E consecratione Barlovii nihil in registro Cranmeri occurrere, & tu ipse observas, & ego, nisi sæpiùs evoluto registro illo maximè fallor, fidenter asserere valeam. In archivis Asslavenfis nullum Barlovii registrum omninò invenitur; neque aliquid ab illo in eo episcopatu actum, quod in registrum inferi debuit. In Menevensibus sunt quidem aliorum quorundam episcoporum registra: sed uti major eorum pars dudum perierit, ita inter cætera illud Barlovii desideratur. Casu hoc an consultò factum, dicere nequeo: hoc tantùm ex instrumento publico compèri, <sup>9</sup> “Robertum Farrar Barlovii in episcopatu Menevensi successorem, autoritate regia sedis suæ libros ecclesiasticos, martyrologia, portiforia, missalia cum calendariis, in quibus nomina episcoporum tempusq; eorum admissionis, mortis, translationis inscribi solebant, flammis commisisse,” ex quibus aliter hæc tam anxie quæsitæ consecratio, fortasse probari potuisset.

In ecclesia metropolitana Cantuariensi undè commissiones pro consecrationibus episcoporum provinciæ extra ecclesiam suam cathedralem concedi solebant, ex ruinis variis, nuperoque incendio quædam registra evaserunt. In illis adhuc apparent commissiones quindecim pro consecrandis episcopis, ab anno 1506 ad annum 1531. Ab illo anno, usque ad 1541, acta omnia periire. Cætera provinciæ registra eò minùs moror, quòd ex more disciplinæ nostræ, ubicunque demùm consecratus fuerit Barlovius, sive in ecclesia aliqua cathedrali sive (quod potiùs crediderim) in sacello alicujus episcopi, alteriùsve cujusdam in dig-

<sup>9</sup> Inquisitio fact. 17. April. 4. Ed. VI. de vacatione episcopi Menev. inter MSS. Wharton L. pag. 239.

nitate ecclesiastica constituti, & oratorium intra aedes suas habentis, acta consecrationis non in registrum loci illius, ubi res gesta fuerat, referri deberent, sed in instrumento separato inscribi, & ad archiepiscopum Cantuariensem, cujus commissionis vigore res transacta fuerat, protinus transmitti.

Et quid demùm ipsum Champnæum impulerit, ut de consecratione Barlovii dubitaret? An famâ publicâ ad ejus cognitionem hic defectus pervenerit, quæ quamvis sæpius mendax, aliquando tamen vera refert? An aliquo idoneo authore rem didicit? nec hoc quidem dicere potuit. Sufficit ei quod in Cranmeri registro hujus consecrationis acta non occurrant, <sup>r</sup> ac proindè de consecratione ejus meritò esse dubitandum: Fatemur libenter; sed nec aliorum plurium episcoporum, de quorum tamen consecratione, nec Champnæus si viveret, dubitandum censeret: imò de quorum consecrationibus, ex aliis publicis instrumentis certò nobis constat.

Foxius Herefordensis nullibi in illo registro consecratus invenitur. Ex Rymero <sup>s</sup> consecratum fuisse comperimus, idque 26 die Septembris anno 1535, uti in ipsius registro inter nuperi episcopi Eliensis Codices MSS. asservato, expressè refertur.

<sup>t</sup> Sampson Cicesterensis, <sup>u</sup> Latimerus Wigorniensis, <sup>x</sup> Hilsley Roffensis omnes pro non consecratis habendi sunt, si quidem rectè Champnæus ex registri Cranmeriani silentio ea in re concludit. At ex publicis tabulis planè apparet quemlibet eorum ritè fuisse consecratum.

De Reppis Norwicensi episcopo, res adhuc manifestior. Acta consecrationis illius nullibi in registro Cranmeri comparent; & tamen ex eodem <sup>y</sup> registro patet illum à Cranmero fuisse sacra-

<sup>r</sup> Champn. de Vocat. Ministror. cap. 14. pag. 491.  
mer, vol. 14. pag. 550.  
pag. 553.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. pag. 573.

<sup>y</sup> Regist. Cranm. fol. 212.

<sup>s</sup> Ry-

<sup>u</sup> Ibid.

### 374 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

tum; certificante hoc regi archiepiscopo, & attestante, qui consecrationi ipsius interfuit, notario publico.

Gardineri episcopi Wintoniensis nec confirmatio, nec consecratio, in Warhami archiepiscopi Cantuar. registro hodie invenitur. Hoc eò magis considerandum, quia consecrari quidem ab aliis potuit, confirmari nisi ab archiepiscopo, ejusve commissario non potuit: adeò tamen de hujus episcopi & confirmatione & consecratione omnes tabulæ publicæ silent, ut inter eruditissimos harum rerum investigatores, nec de anno conveniat, quo confirmatus ac consecratus fuit. <sup>2</sup> Quo igitur jure de Barlovii charactere dubitatur, eodem de ordine episcopali Gardineri, summi horum hominum antesignani, dubitare necesse est.

Gardinerus primus fuit in commissione pro consecratione Bonneri Londinensis episcopi, proximi eorundem zelotarum post Gardinarum ducis atque signiferi. Ab illo, assistentibus sibi Ciccstrensi atque Herefordensi episcopis, sacratus fuit Bonnerus<sup>a</sup>. Si igitur Parkeri consecratio ideo pro invalida sit habenda, quòd de Barlovii ordinatione fileant registra, sequetur nec Bonnerum fuisse à Gardinero legitimè sacratum.

Infinitus essem si ad alios omnes ordine transirem, ab hujusmodi episcopis sacratos. Unum omnino præterire non possum, eminentissimum Parkeri prædecessores, cardinalem Polum; cujus benedictioni sex aderant episcopi. Horum duorum Nicolai Heath Eboracensis archiepiscopi, & Thomæ Thyrleby Eliensis episcopi consecrationes in registris extant. Bonnerus, qui secundum in illo officio locum obtinuit, à Gardinero sacratus fuit, cujus consecratio nullibi in tabulis publicis reperitur. Et quanquam non adeò si-

<sup>2</sup> Godwin *de Præsul. Angl.* 1534. *sic* Wharton, *Anglia S. vol. 1. pag. 319. at Rym. vol. 14. pag. 419.* temporalia ei restituta ostendit Decemb. 5. 1531. & licentia pro ejus consecratione emanavit 27 Nov. ejusdem an. ut ex regist. Cantuar. patet.

<sup>a</sup> Reg. Cranm. fol. 259.



denter de cæteris pronuntiare libet, id tamen dicam, neque Patis Wigorniensis, neque Whiti Lincolnensis, neque Griffith Rossensis, neque Goldwelli Assa-venensis, consecrationes, quamvis diligenter quæsitæ, adhuc à me inventas esse, adeoque de sex illustrissimi cardinalis consecratoribus quatuor sub eodem defectu cum Barlovio laborasse. Aut igitur Gardinerum, Bonnerum, & ipsum reverendissimum archiepiscopum Polum de suo ordine dejiciendos concedant hi cavillatores; aut si hos canonicè consecratos fuisse contendant, non obstante registorum silentio, de quo nos minimè dubitamus; quod æquum, quod justum, quod verum est, fateantur, neque de consecratione Matthæi Parkeri dubitari posse: præsertim cùm constet non modò tres de quatuor ejus consecratoribus, certissimè fuisse sacratos, sed & ipsum quartum, invictis probationibus, episcopalem characterem habuisse ostenditur.

Ex his tam multis & variis exemplis, apparet quàm infirmum, quàm incertum, quàm planè nullum sit Champnæi argumentum contra Barlovii consecrationem. Quòd si à me quæras, cur hujusce consecrationis acta in registrum Cranmeri aut nunquam relata fuerint, aut si aliquando in illo describerentur, postea exciderint; & mihi vicissim te rogare liceat, cur tot aliorum episcoporum consecrationes in eodem registro non inveniuntur? & præcipuè illorum episcoporum qui eodem ferè tempore cum Barlovio consecrati fuerant: Foxii Herefordensis, Latimeri Wigorniensis, Sampsonis Cicestrensis, Hilsley Rossensis, quorum omnium consecrationes infrà annum factæ, in registro Cranmeri desiderantur? Post ducentos & amplius annos, de hujusmodi defectibus, vix aut ne vix quidem hariolari datur. Ego sanè adeò longè absum, ut quæram, cur quædam consecrationes in illius registro non appareant, ut potius mirandum censeam tot adhuc nobis relinqui; imò totum registrum in eodem cum domino suo rogo non interiisse.

### 376 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

Ut enim de privatis hujusmodi actuum perditoribus nihil dicam, constat commissiones publicè sub regina Maria emanasse ad registra, aliaque ejusmodi acta inspicienda; fideisque hominibus id negotii datum, ut quidquid invenerint, vel contra veterem ecclesiasticam institutionem, vel contra Romani pontificis auctoritatem à se restitutam antea factum, penitus delerent. Quid hi fecerint cum registro Cranmeri, quis hominum nunc viventium vel dicere vel hariolari potest? Forte igitur etiam hujus consecrationis acta olim in hoc registrum inserta fuerint, quamvis in eo frustrà hodie quærantur. Certè suspicione non caret, quòd tot episcoporum consecrationes eodem tempore factæ ex illo exciderint; quorum plerique notoriè dignoscuntur regio suprematui & reformationi religionis impensè favisse. Fortasse nec ab initio in illud referebantur. Ut enim de cæterorum consecrationibus nihil ampliùs dicam, Barlovius confirmatus fuit episcopus Assavenfis 23 die Febr. an. 1535. Absens tum erat ab urbe, in regiis negotiis extra regnum occupatus. Hinc confirmatio ejus per procuratorem facta, & ipse verisimiliter vigore commissionis archiepiscopalis ruri consecratus. Eo ipso tempore quo hæc facta fuerint, mortem obiit Ricardus Rawlins Menevensis episcopus 18 die ejusdem mensis. In ejus locum substitutus est Barlovius tanta cum celeritate, ut, decimo die insequentis Aprilis, illius electio per præcentorem & capitulum Menevense expedita fuerit. Intra hoc tam angustum temporis spatium, Barlovius ad duos episcopatus, Assavensem & Menevensem electus, confirmatus, &, ut nos constanter asserimus, etiam episcopus consecratus fuit. Quid mirum si in tot rebus tam brevi temporis curriculo faciendis, quædam negligerentur, quæ ordinariè fieri consueverunt? & consecrationis Barlovianæ acta vel ad archiepiscopum non omninò mitterentur, vel ab actuario in registrum illius non inscriberentur? cui fortè absurdum videbatur consecrationem Barlovii ad episcopatum Assavensem illic inferere, qui antequam id fieri potuit, ad episc-

episcopatum Menevensem à rege nominatus, fortè & à capitulo fuerat electus.

Atque hinc patet (ut etiam illud in transitu observem) cur Barlovius in litteris regiis totoque processu electionis successoris sui Roberti Warton, dictus fuit Assavensis electus. Cum enim certum sit, illum nunquam possessionem episcopatus Assavensis habuisse, cum nec in sedem episcopalem installatus fuerit, neque à rege temporalia acceperit; cum denique nec de confirmatione, nec de consecratione illius capitulo Assavensi aliquo legitimo modo constaret; ut non solum ex actorum publicorum hac in parte silentio, verum etiam ex ipsa temporis brevitate inter confirmationem ejus in episcopum Assavensem, & electionem in episcopum Menevensem, meritò concludi possit: Sequitur eum quantumvis reipsa ut certò scimus confirmatum, & ut par est credere, etiam consecratum; respectu tamen sedis Assavensis, nihil amplius quam episcopum electum jure dici potuisse, utpote cujus nec confirmatio nec consecratio illius ecclesiæ capitulo, in debita juris forma, fuisset certificata.

Neque hîc considerare oportet illud temporis spatium quod intercessit inter Barlovii dimissionem sedis Assavensis, & successoris sui electionem, atque consecrationem; cùm omnia quæcunque dicta sint de Barlovio in illo electionis & confirmationis Wartonianæ processu, respiciunt solum illud tempus quo fuerat episcopus Assavensis. Et vel intra illud spatium consecrari potuit Barlovius episcopus Assavensis, ac nihilominus rectè appellari episcopus electus, si nec illa consecratio decano & capitulo Assavensi ritè significata fuerat, nec ulla installatio, aut temporalium restitutio exindè sit secuta, ut sanè clarè apparet nullam secutam fuisse. Atque in hoc consentientem nobiscum habemus ipsum Champnæum<sup>b</sup>, ne quid dicam de Henrici VIII. statuto<sup>c</sup> de creandis episcopis facto; ubi omnes episcopi tamdiù pro electis habendi censentur, donec omnia

<sup>b</sup> Cap. 14. p. 506.

<sup>c</sup> Stat. 25 Hen. VIII. cap. 20.



378 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

quæ ad eorum perfectam constitutionem ea lege requiruntur, sint peracta; quæ in hoc Barlovii casu, respectu sedis Assavenfis, nunquam peragebantur.

Quod ad titulum spectat electi Assavenfis, Barlovio, in processu electionis atque confirmationis Wartoni successoris ejus, attributum; quoniam ea quæ de eo antea scripsi, nondum tibi plenè satisfecerint, rem ipsam paulò fusiùs clariùsque exponam. Atque hîc ante omnia observandum, in <sup>d</sup> *statuto de electione, confirmatione, & consecratione archiepiscopi sive episcopi* duos tantùm titulos recenseri eorum, qui ad hujusmodi dignitates admittuntur: quorum alter est restrictior, dum processus adhuc incompletus manet, nec ad finem, modo lege illa constituto, perducitur; scilicet domini electi: alter generalis, episcopi, sive archiepiscopi diœceseos, ad quam quis fuerat electus.

Electione igitur episcopi à decano & capitulo factâ, regique sub eorum sigillo communi certificatâ, exinde vigore illius statuti, qui sic eligitur nomine Domini electi talis diœceseos gaudere decernitur. Postquam verò autoritate regia confirmatus & consecratus fuerit, virtute ejusdem statuti in omnibus accipi jubetur; juxta nomen, titulum, gradum, & dignitatem episcopi diœceseos, ad quam electus fuerat, omniaque munia quæ ad suam dignitatem spectant, ut alius quivis archiepiscopus, sive episcopus præstare permittitur. Hæc summa est illius statuti: atque hinc apparet, episcopum ante electionem factam, regique certificatam, nullum omninò titulum de jure habere; postquam hoc fuerit perfectum, titulo domini electi insigniri: ubi verò electio sic certificata etiam confirmata fuerit, ac (si opus sit) consecratio facta, tum demùm jus illi dari ad nomen, titulum, gradum, & dignitatem episcopi diœceseos, ad quam electus, & confirmatus fuerat.

<sup>d</sup> Stat. 25 Henr. VIII. cap. 20.

Et ne de hac nostra illius statuti expositione dubites, confirmationem illius omni exceptione majorem tibi exhibebit formula consecrationis episcopalis; quæ cum statutis regni sæpius stabilita fuit, etiam ipsa vim legis obtinere censetur. In hac forma primum episcopus electus à duobus episcopis archiepiscopo præsentari jubetur, idque ut in episcopum consecratur. Præsentatus his verbis juramentum obedientiæ canonicæ archiepiscopo præstat: "Ego electus episcopus talis ecclesiæ & sedis, promitto, &c." In Litania, suffragium pro consecrando hoc modo concipitur: "Ut Deus fratri electo benedicere dignetur." Examinatione peractâ, episcopus electus habitu se episcopali induit. Et denique cæteris precibus finitis, cum jam ad ipsum actum consecrationis processuri sunt archiepiscopus, eique assistentes episcopi, jubetur episcopus electus genua flectere, dum manus illi imponuntur. Quo peracto, & jam consecrato electo, statim nomen episcopi illi confertur; & noviter consecratus episcopus, cum reliquis præsentibus communicare de corpore & sanguine Christi mandatur. Adeò certò constat usque ad ipsum consecrationis articulum, nullum aliud nomen alicui de jure competere, quàm illud episcopi electi; quamvis honoris causâ episcopi titulum absque aliqua ejusmodi additione, etiam in publicis instrumentis, nondum consecratis quandoque attribui videamus.

Quod ulteriùs addis, nullum tibi exemplum adhuc occurrissè alicujus episcopi, nisi solius Barlovii, qui ejusmodi electi titulo in brevibus regiis nominatur; si quidem id eodem sensu, quo Barlovius sic dictus est, intelligas, cum respectu scilicet ad priorem episcopatum ad quem antea fuerat electus, ego sanè id minimè miror: Tres quippe solummodò episcopos observavi, qui his ducentis annis proximè elapsis, ad secundas sedes transierint, antequam ad priores consecrati fuissent. Horum primus est <sup>e</sup> Barlovius ille, de quo hîc

<sup>e</sup> Reg. Cranm. fol. 241, 243.

agitur; secundus Bonnerus, qui cum in legatione ultra mare diu detineretur, ad episcopatum Herefordensem absens electus, ac confirmatus est, eumque uno ferè anno tenuit non consecratus; ac deinde ad sedem Londinensem transiit, nondùm in patriam reversus. Postquam in patriam rediit, & jam aliquot post confirmationem ejus in alteram illam sedem suam mensibus consecrandus esset; in brevi regio pro consecratione ejus, idem hic titulus episcopi Herefordensis electi occurrit. Et quia illud instrumentum a Rymero omittitur, non abs re fuerit, hic integrum apponere.

**H**ENRICUS VIII. <sup>f</sup> Dei Gratiâ Angliæ & Franciæ Rex, fidei defensor, dominus Hybernæ, & in terra supremum caput Anglicanæ ecclesiæ, rev. in Christo patri Thomæ Cantuariensi archiep. totius Angliæ primate & metrop. salutem.

Quia nos de gratia nostra speciali, ac ex mero motu nostro, electioni nuper de dilecto & fideli consiliario nostro Edmundo Bonner, episcopo ecclesiæ cathedralis Herefordensis electo & confirmato, ac jam in episcopum & pastorem ecclesiæ nostræ cathedralis S. Pauli London. per decanum & capitulum ejusdem ecclesiæ ritè & legitimè factæ & celebratæ, prout per literas certificatorias eorundem decani & capituli sigillo suo sigillatas, nobis directas & deliberatas, plenius apparet, nostrum regium assensum adhibuimus, prout per præsentis adhibemus: Vobis per hæc scripta mandamus, quatenus hujusmodi electionem & electum cum omni celeritate accommoda in episcopum London. confirmetis, ac munus tam consecrationis quàm confirmationis eidem, quando ad hoc ex parte sua fueritis requisiti, debitè impendatis; ac cætera omnia & singula faciatis & exequamini, quæ vestro in hac parte incumbunt officio. In cujus rei testimonium has literas nostras fieri fecimus patentes. Teste



meipso apud Walden 26 die mensis Martii, anno regni nostri 31.

H. Assheton.

In hoc brevi illa equidem crassa vel ignorantia vel negligentia scriptoris observanda est, quod regio nomine Bonnerum mense Novembri antea confirmatum, nihilominus (pro more horum instrumentorum) confirmari ac consecrari jussit. Illud rectè factum, quod eum respectu utriusque sedis, tam Herefordensis quam Londinensis, non simpliciter episcopum, sed electum nominat, utpote nunquam illius, nondum hujus dioceseos episcopum.

Tertius post hunc sequitur Rev. P. Guilielmus & Juxon, ad episcopatum Herefordensem, uti antea Bonnerus, electus an. 1633, & ante consecrationem ad sedem pariter Londinensem translatus. In hujus Rev. P. processu omnia ad normam illius Wartoni expressè recensentur. Ipse Actorum titulus sic inscribitur: *Acta, habita & facta in negotio confirmationis, electionis factæ de persona R. viri W. Juxon Ill. D. Herefordensis episcopi electi, in episcopum & pastorem ecclesiæ cathedralis D. Pauli Lond. nominati & electi, die Mercurii, 23 viz. die mensis Octobris, A. D. 1633.*

In brevi de regio assensu vocatur <sup>h</sup> Herefordensis electus, in procuratorio decani, & capituli; in commissione archiepiscopi; in summaria petitione pro confirmatione coram judice exhibita; in certificatorio de electione archiepiscopo misso, alioque ipsi episcopo oblato; in instrumento de illius consensu electioni adhibito; in sententia denique judicis definitiva, ubicunque nominis ejus mentio occurrit, semper eodem titulo Herefordensis electi insignitur; etiam in actu consecrationis, consecratores dicuntur munus consecrationis Rev. viro Guil. Juxon legum doctori Herefordensi electo, in episcopum & pastorem ecclesiæ cathed. D. Pauli London. electo & confirmato,

<sup>g</sup> Regist. Laud. fol. 12. a.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. fol. 13, 18.

382 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

impendisse: adeò nihil singulare in illa designatione Barlovii fuit; qui tamen in sua confirmatione in sedem Menevensensem, solo episcopi nomine ubique appellatur.

Sed ne te ulteriùs offendat titulus electi Barlovio attributi, ad tuum te Rymerum remitto; ubi in brevibus regiis pro restitutionibus temporalium centies invenies episcopos non solum confirmatos, sed & consecratos, eodem illo electorum nomine appellatos. Cranmerus <sup>i</sup> consecratus fuit 30 die Martii an 1533. At nihilominus in brevi pro restitutione temporalium suorum dato 29 die Aprilis proximè insequentis, dicitur tantum, nuper electus, & sub illo titulo, temporalia illi restituuntur. In restitutionibus temporalium plurimorum aliorum episcoporum, consecratio eorum in ipsis brevibus memoratur: attamen etiam hi eodem electorum titulo designantur; licet non solum consecratos, verum etiam episcopalibus insigniis investitos fuisse agnoscantur. En ipsa brevium regionum verba: <sup>k</sup> *Nos confirmationem & consecrationem illas acceptantes, fidelitatem ipsius electi & confirmati — cepimus. Et ideo tibi præcipimus quòd eidem electo temporalia — liberes. Et mandatum est militibus, &c. tenentibus de episcopatu El. quòd eidem electo tanquam episcopo & domino suo in omnibus quæ ad episcopatum prædictum pertinent, intendentes sint & respondentes.* Atque hæc de titulo episcopi electi respondisse sufficiat.

Quod verò scribis à quibusdam excipi contra Barlovii consecrationem, illum scilicet non tam episcopum quam usufructuarium suorum episcopatum fuisse, adeoque nulla benedictione episcopali opus habuisse, facile refellitur. <sup>l</sup> Ad Assavensem quippe episcopatum modo legibus nostris præscripto nominatus, electus, confirmatus fuit. Hæc in usufructuario ne-

<sup>i</sup> Rym. tom. 14. pag. 456.  
gistr. Cranm. fol. 179.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. pag. 487, &c.

<sup>l</sup> Re-

que fiunt unquam, neque fieri debent. Ut enim totum hunc processum paulò distinctiùs consideremus; primò capitulum Assavense regi significavit mortem nuperi sui episcopi Henrici Standish, ac petiit licentiam alium in locum illius eligendi. De quo hîc episcopo agitur? De usufructuario, an de diocesano episcopo? aut qualem sibi petunt eligendi facultatem? Alium in locum defuncti episcopi, id est talem qualis ille mortuus episcopus fuerat, & qualem ecclesia sua atque diœcesis suo destituta pastore, ipsius loco exoptabant.

Rex votis capituli annuit: licentiam eligendi episcopum concedit: commendat capitulo Barlovium, tanquam hominem idoneum ad munus pastoris sive episcopi exequendum. Quem credas hîc episcopum designari? An œconomum, qui temporalia, uti vocant, episcopatûs administraret, & ex iis lautè viveret? an pastorem, qui veri episcopi officium ad commodum ecclesiæ atque diœceseos exequeretur? Capitulum, hâc licentiâ à rege obtentâ, Barlovium sibi eligit in episcopum & pastorem: archiepiscopus electionem confirmat: omnia fiunt ut in processu diœcesani episcopi & pastoris, qualis & fuit & semper habitus est Barlovius.

In altero illo episcopatu Menevensi sumendo iisdem gradibus per omnia progressus est. Capitulum regi significavit mortem sui episcopi, viduitatem ecclesiæ, vacationem episcopatûs, & licentiam petiit alium sibi eligendi in pastorem atque episcopum suæ diœceseos. Concessa est à rege quam petierat licentia. Electio à capitulo facta, à rege accepta, ab archiepiscopo confirmata est; atque hæc omnia priùs quàm proventus sive redditus episcopatûs (quos nos temporalia dicimus) illi restituti fuerint. Ex quibus omnibus planè apparet, Barlovium primò fuisse episcopum factum, ac deindè ad usufructum sui episcopatûs admissum, per restitutionem scilicet temporalium, quæ tum demùm de jure fieri debet, postquam episcopus per electionem, confirmationem, atque consecrationem, ad mu-



### 384 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

nus, five ad officium episcopi & pastoris suæ diœceseos plenè promotus fuerit, atque ad illud ritu legitimo admissus.

Quàm longè ab hoc processu in electione atque confirmatione diœcesani episcopi distet usufructuarii constitutio, ipsæ ejusmodi œconomorum literæ, quales apud Rymerum <sup>m</sup> plures occurrunt, satis per se ostendunt. Et ne hac de re ullatenùs dubites, alio argumento, ex tabulis publicis, perspicuè ostendam. In summonitionibus ad comitia regni, quæ nos parlamenta vocamus, omnes archiepiscopi atque episcopi infra regnum Angliæ existentes, brevi regio summonentur. Si quis episcopus extra regnum fuerit, aut si fortè episcopatus aliquis vacare contigerit, loco episcopi, custos spiritualitatis summonetur. Ut verò cognoscas, quis sit ille custos spiritualitatis, sciendum est quòd quoties aliquis episcopatus pastore suo destituitur, jurisdictio illius spiritualis ad archiepiscopum provinciæ devolvitur, uti reddituum administratio atque ususfructus ad regem. Et quemadmodum rex ad temporalia recipienda & administranda certos suos officarios habet; ita archiepiscopus ad spiritualia exercenda gravem aliquem virum legum ecclesiasticarum peritum nominat, qui exindè custos spiritualitatis vocatur. Hujus autoritas infra diœcesin vacantem, vigore commissionis archiepiscopi tam diu durat, donec novus episcopus eligitur, & ab archiepiscopo confirmatur; quo factò, jurisdictio spiritualis ad episcopum confirmatum redit, & ab illo exerceri incipit. Ubi igitur aliquis custos spiritualitatis invenitur, qui jurisdictionem spiritualem infra diœcesin administrat, ubi aut nullus omninò est episcopus, aut episcopus extra regnum abiit, aut à jurisdictionis suæ exercitio ob causam aliquam suspenditur: E contra, si sit aliquis in diœcesi episcopus legitimè constitutus, ibi custos spiritualitatis nullus esse potest. Quibus sic expositis, clarissimè patet quòd episcopus ad parlamentum sum-

<sup>m</sup> *Tem. 14. pag. 268, 280, 387, 388.*

monitus nomine episcopi cujusvis diœceseos, necessariò pro vero loci illius episcopo habendus sit. At in summonitionibus duorum parliamentorum, quorum alterum fuit anni 1536, partim post promotionem Barlovii ad episcopatum Menevensem, alterum anni 1541, Barlovius summonitus fuit sub titulo episcopi Menevensis. Nec inter custodes spiritualitatis ad illa parliamenta summonitos, ullus episcopatus Menevensis custos ejusmodi occurrit<sup>n</sup>; ac proindè certissimè constat episcopatum Menevensem eo tempore non vacasse, sed episcopum suum diœcesanum, quales alii omnes episcopi iisdem brevibus summoniti fuerant, habuisse.

Hisce argumentis pro consecratione Barlovii adductis, & illud addere liceat, ipsum non solum ad regni comitia, brevibus regiis, nomine episcopi Menevensis sæpè fuisse summonitum; sed & ab archiepiscopo ad synodos provinciales eodem nomine vocatum; in iis cum cæteris episcopis, tanquam episcopus, deliberasse, conclusisse, & conclusis cum fratribus subscripsisse.

Hujus argumenti vim ut clariùs percipias, notandum erit archiepiscopos nostros ad synodos suas provinciales, literis suis mandatoriis, citare omnes suæ provinciæ episcopos: absentium episcoporum, si qui extra regnum fuerint, vicarios in spiritualibus generales: episcopatum denique vacantium custodes spiritualitatis, de quibus paulò antea diximus. Aliquando etiam electi & confirmati, quamvis nondùm consecrati episcopi, ad comparendum in hujusmodi synodis summonentur; sed cum adjuncta semper restrictione electorum & confirmatorum. Cum igitur Barlovius absque aliqua hujusmodi nota, ad has synodos sæpiùs & citaretur ab archiepiscopo sub simplici titulo episcopi Menevensis, eoque nomine cum cæteris episcopis earum actis subscripsit; quid aliud concludere

# 386 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

possumus, nisi eum fuisse revera episcopum diocesanos Menevensis, non custodem spiritualitatis; episcopum consecratum, non electum & confirmatum tantum, cum nulla ejusmodi restrictio nomini ejus adjecta appareat?

Anno 1536, paucis post promotionem ejus ad episcopatum Menevensis mensibus, synodo provinciali Londini interfuit, atque articulis religionis in illo concilio editis, ultimus episcoporum, tanquam episcopus Menevensis subscripsit <sup>o</sup>.

In eadem synodo, declarationi ejus de generalibus conciliis eodem modo manum suam apposuit <sup>p</sup>.

Anno sequenti 1537, & synodo interfuit, & libro de Institutione Hominis Christiani, cum reliquis episcopis subscripsit, ut ex ipsa ejus præfatione apparet.

Anno 1540, nationali synodo aderat, ac sententiæ ejus contra matrimonium regis cum Anna Clivenfi subscripsit <sup>q</sup>.

Anno denique 1552, synodo provinciali tempore Edvardi VI. & præsens interfuit, & articulis religionis subscripsit <sup>r</sup>.

In his omnibus, cum reliquis episcopis, tanquam episcopus egit; neque alio quàm episcopi Menevensis nomine perpetuò indigitatur.

Quod ex his exemplis apparet illi in publicis provinciæ synodis fuisse tributum, etiam à privatis personis, iisque illi inimicissimis, concessum fuisse invenimus.

Gardinerus in epist. ad protectorem regni ducem Somersetensem, contra concionem quandam illius scriptâ, eum nomine appellat Domini Menevensis episcopi, & fratris sui Menevensis <sup>s</sup>. Et cum postea, regnante Maria, religionis causâ idem Barlovius in carcerem conjectus fuit, & coram commissariis regis adductus, inter quos Gardinerus præsidebat, adeò cau-

<sup>o</sup> Burnet hist. reform. vol. 1. pag. 314. append.

Colleg. Bened. Cantabr. miscell. 8. fol. 401.

Cranm. fol. 141, 142.

<sup>r</sup> Heylin quinquarticular. hist. Par. 2. cap. 12. §. 3.

<sup>s</sup> Fox B. of Martyrs, vol. 2. pag. 714.

<sup>p</sup> MSS.

<sup>q</sup> Regist.



sam suam egit <sup>t</sup>, ut non solum non ad rogam condempnatus fuerit, verum etiam è carcere dimissus; episcopatu suo tantum, quem antea in manus regias resignasse videtur, privatus: An sic credas illos hominem tractaturos, quem noverant per tot annos duos episcopatus, absque aliqua consecratione tenuisse, etiam officium episcopi impiè atque prophanè, si quidem ita se res habuisset, exercuisse; & poenam adeò tali flagitio condignam meruisse?

Quid verò ipsa regina, zelo seu potius furore contra reformatos usque ad insaniam percita? Resignationem etiam illa episcopatus Wellensis à Barlovio accepit: eumque, in licentia eligendi novum episcopum, vacare pronunciavit per resignationem ultimi episcopi ibidem <sup>v</sup>. Et rursus in brevi pro restitutione temporalium successori ejus recitat episcopatum vacasse per liberam resignationem ultimi episcopi ibidem. Fidem tuam appello, vir eruditissime, siccine regina locuta fuisset, si Barlovius nunquam fuisset sacratus? an non potius contra illum intonuisset, eumque ejecisset, tanquam invasorem nominis atque officii ad quod nullo jure, divino aut humano, ritè fuisset admissus?

Sed hîc obiter quæris, quomodo Barlovius, qui in his brevibus dicitur episcopatum suum libere resignasse, in alio tamen brevi, De significavit, ponitur deprivatus; & episcopatus ejus per deprivationem & amotionem ejus vacasse declaratur? Quamvis de hac re nihil extra conjecturas proferre valeam, dicam tamen quod sentio, eoque liberius, quod vel in illis literis, Barlovius tanquam verus episcopus tractatur; atque sedes illa vacare refertur per deprivationem ultimi episcopi ibidem.

Mariâ reginâ sexto die Julii an. 1553 ad solium evectâ, Barlovius protinus captus fuit, & cum Joanne Cardmakero, ecclesiæ suæ præbendario in carcerem conjectus. Non diu illic detentus fuerat, cum timore mortis percussus, ut, si quâ posset arte, salvus

<sup>t</sup> Id. vol. 3. pag. 246.

<sup>v</sup> Rymer, vol. 15. pag. 369, 384.

### 388 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

inde evaderet, episcopatum suum in manus regias resignavit: quam resignationem regina accipiens 13 die Martii proximè insequentis, <sup>x</sup> *Decano & capitulo Wellingensi licentiam eligendi alium episcopum in ecclesiam suam cathedralem concessit, per liberam & spontaneam resignationem ultimi episcopi ibidem pastoris solatio destitutam*, ut in brevi regio recitatur. Quòd si suæ ecclesiæ, ipsâ reginâ testante, episcopus ac pastor fuit Barlovius, aut ego quid illis vocibus significetur omninò non intelligo, aut eo ipso fatendum est, eum revera fuisse in episcopum consecratum, & pro tali à regina publicè acceptum.

Eodem die commissio emanavit episcopo Wintoniensi regni cancellario, & aliis quinque episcopis, ad deprivandum archiepiscopum Eboracensem, ac episcopos Menevensensem, Cestrensem, & Bristoliensem, eò quòd nuptias de facto, cum de jure non deberent, contraxissent. In hac commissione Barlovius omittitur, utpotè qui jam antea episcopatu suo ultrò se spoliasset.

<sup>y</sup> Duobus postea diebus 15 die Martii, altera eisdem episcopis commissio directà est, ad procedendum contra tres alios episcopos, Lincolniensem, Wigorniensem, atque Herefordensem; eosque (vigore clausulæ in concessione episcopatum illorum ab Edvardo VI. literis suis patentibus insertæ, quòd nimirum eos tenerent, quamdiu se benè gesserint) de sedibus suis expellendos.

<sup>z</sup> Barlovius interim adhuc in carcere custoditus, ut à mortis periculo se liberaret, nullum non lapidem movit, nec dubitavit etiam cum conscientiæ jactura salutis suæ consulere. Hinc primò librum olim contra Lutheranos à se scriptum, dum adhuc regularis esset canonicus, Gardinero cæterisque reginæ commissariis, ut videtur, exhibuit; & vel ipse denuò imprimendum curavit, vel iis, ut illum imprimerent, commi-

<sup>x</sup> Rymer, *tom.* 15. *pag.* 369.

<sup>y</sup> Rymer, *ibid.*

<sup>z</sup> Strype Memor. Eccles. *tom.* 3. *c.* 18. *pag.* 153.

fit. Certè ante finem an. 1553, liber iste rursus editus fuit. <sup>a</sup> cum præfatione nova ad lectores contra reformatos, quos deterrimis coloribus editor depingit, & furiosâ rabie acriter perstringit. Neque hâc contentus, etiam petitionem reginæ exhibuit, quâ omnes suos libros contra religionem catholicam scriptos ipse simul damnat ac revocat, Deoque gratias agit, quòd ex infinita sua bonitate se à tenebris in lucem, ex ignorantia mortali ad vivam veritatis cognitionem perduxisset; & sic denique reginæ misericordiam implorat, seque illius beneplacito in omnibus submittit.

Dum hæc aguntur, Bournius ad episcopatum Wellensem soli resignationi Barlovii fidere noluit; sed, ut ex regio assensu colligitur, etiam episcopatu suo eum privandum duxit: hoc si revera factum sit, (neque enim de deprivatione ejus aliquid alibi occurrit) tum ex tenore commissionum jam suprà citatarum, tum ex toto processu Barlovii ante descripto, sequetur eum vel conjugii sui causâ, <sup>b</sup> quod nullatenus dissimulare potuit, vel ob hæreticæ pravitatis crimen à seipso, ut ostendimus, recognitæ, à dignitate suâ fuisse amotum: neque enim in tota petitione sua reginæ oblatâ, aliud aliquid, nisi erroneæ doctrinæ confessio occurrit. Et cum coram commissariis regiis unâ cum præbendario suo Cardmakero comparuit, <sup>c</sup> & de fide atque doctrina sua ab iis interrogaretur, illeque adeo vel cautè vel falsò respondit, aut quasi catholicus ab iis dimitteretur: De immani illo facinore, atque ultimo supplicio eorum sententiâ digno, quòd non consecratus, per tot annos officium episcopi exercuisset, ne verbo quidem agebatur; neque tale aliquod crimen

<sup>a</sup> *A Dialogue describing the original ground of these Lutheran factions, and many of their abuses; compyled by Syr William Barlowe Chanon, late Byshop of Bathe, an. 1553.* <sup>b</sup> Hoc innui videtur in illo decani & capituli Cantuar. registro, ubi sic annotatur: Bathon. & Wellens. vacavit per resignationem Will. Barlow conjugati; cui successit Gilbertus Bourne. <sup>c</sup> Fox Martyrol. tom. 3. pag. 246.



illi unquam objectum fuisse, in eorum temporum actis memoratur.

Hæc igitur mea est sententia, Barlovium vel nunquam reipsâ fuisse deprivatum, sed, ut alia omnia instrumenta regia & registri Cantuariensis autoritas plane astruunt, episcopatum suum sponte sua resignasse; vel si ad corroborandum Bournii titulum, sententia aliqua deprivationis in ipsum ferebatur, eam ob confessæ hæreticæ pravitatis crimen, & scelera atque peccata enormia ab eo commissâ (scilicet quod episcopus ac presbyter, ac olim etiam canonicus regularis, uxorem duxisset) latam fuisse, non quod in episcopum nunquam consecratus esset; cujus nulla prorsus vestigia in illius hominis vita aut factis inveniuntur.

Atque equidem cui bono scripta sua contra catholicos edita revocasset; librum in reformatos olim publicatum rursus in lucem emisisset; errores tot annis à se rejectos pro veris fidei articulis denuò recepisset; sed præcipuè episcopatum suum in regias manus resignasset; si tantum adhuc ac tam nefarium facinus sibi objiciendum cognovisset, quod nulla arte vel dissimulare poterat, vel excusare? Aut quis credat reginam resignationem episcopatûs Wellensis ab illo accipere voluisse, ac episcopatum illum resignatione ejus pastore vacuum pronuntiare: si vel minimam suspicionem habuisset adeò capitalis defectûs, quique eum non tam dignitate suâ meritò privandum redderet, quàm nullo unquam justo titulo episcopatum suum tenuisse ostenderet; sed sub episcopi nomine usurpatorem honoris, officii, & beneficii fuisse, cujus prorsus incapacem se, suâ culpâ præstitisset?

Sic igitur credo Barlovium, ut vitæ suæ consulere, episcopatum suum in manus regias voluntariè resignasse, adeoque illum verè, ut in aliis brevibus recitatur, per illius resignationem vacasse: Bournium verò, qui illi successurus erat, non satis se securum putasse dignitatis illius, sic per resignationem vacantis,

nisi

nisi Barlovius omninò ab illa judicialiter amotus atque deprivatus foret. Hoc perfacile fuit Bournio obtinere, contra hominem uxoratum; nec verebatur ne in eo reginæ displiceret, quæ tales omnes, sive episcopos, sive presbyteros, expressè deprivari mandaverat. Auxit proculdubio timorem Bournii quod eo ipso tempore acciderit Miloni Coverdallio episcopo Exoniensi. <sup>d</sup> Voysejus prædecessor ejus, episcopatum Exoniensem in manus regis Edvardi VI. resignaverat. Rex illum Coverdallio concesserat 14 Augusti 1551. <sup>e</sup> Maria Voysejum ad suum episcopatum restituit, Coverdallio absque ullo juridico processu ejecto; eo prætextu, quòd Voysejus “propter  
“justum tam animæ quàm corporis metum, rursùm  
“reddiderat & resignaverat episcopatum suum Exon.  
“in manus regias; ac proindè: Nos, inquit Maria, dictum venerabilem patrem Johannem ad episcopatum Exon. restituimus.” Vidit hoc & approbavit Bournius; ac ne simili modo ipse aliquando sua dignitate privaretur, cavere statuit homo, & alieno periculo cautior factus, & in negotiis plurimùm versatus; ideòque non contentus resignatione Barlovii, quam satis cognoverat eo metu, qui in constantem virum cadere potuit, factam; eum per commissarios regios privari curavit, & in ipso confirmationis atque consecrationis suæ instrumento, in quo sola hæc deprivatio recitatur, expressè recenseri episcopatum Wellensem per deprivationem ultimi episcopi vacuum fuisse.

Hæc igitur, vir clarissime, meâ quidem sententiâ, vera ratio fuit hujusmodi processûs; cui Barlovius & libertatem suam & vitam debuit. Resignato quippè primum sponte suâ episcopatu, & deinde ab eo deprivato, cum ex vita ejus nullum jam superesset Bournio periculum, neque aliud aliquod crimen illi objiceretur; dimittendum hominem censuerunt, quod haudquaquam fecissent, si tam opportunè illi objicere po-

<sup>d</sup> Rymer, vol. 15. pag. 282, 283. <sup>e</sup> Ibid. p. 340.

tuerant, sacrilegè usurpatum, absque omni consecratione, ordinem atque officium episcopi; quod nulli alteri, etiam ex illis quos fidei suæ causa flammis tradiderunt, objectum legimus, aut etiam obiter imputatum.

Sic igitur hunc hominem, tanquam verum episcopum tractarunt inimici ejus, ipsumque, etiam cum ab episcopatu suo ejicerent, tamen pro episcopo habuerunt. Quid de Parkero dicam, qui eum in consecratorum suorum numerum admisit, primasque illi partes in eo solemnī officio concessit? An ignoravit illum, quamvis per rot annos pro episcopo se gerentem, nunquam tamen fuisse ad ordinem, munusque episcopi sacratum? At hoc vetat & ætas & conditio Parkeri, qui cū anno 1534, in familiam reginæ Annæ admīsus fuerat, eodemque tempore triginta ad minimum annos natus; & non tantū in curia versaretur, ubi hæ res agebantur, sed anno insequente coram rege in quadagesima concionatus est, id est eodem anno, fortè & mense, quo sacrari debuit, & nos sacratum fuisse Barlovium contendimus; quomodo ille id nescire potuit, in aulâ regiâ præsens, quod nec absentes latere credibile sit? Novit itaque Parkerus quis homo fuerat Barlovius.

Num igitur dicemus illum scientem, prudentem; à non episcopo consecrari voluisse? Quis talem amentiam viro & prudentissimo & cautissimo, imputaverit? At fortè necesse fuit illi talem consecratorem admittere. Scilicet non potuit à reliquis tribus, indubiè episcopis, canonicè consecrari; aut <sup>f</sup> suffraganeum Thetfordensem, episcopum Ossoriensem, Balæum, loco Barlovii sumere? De quorum § ordinationibus nemo nobis unquam litem moverit, aut movere potuit.

Atque hīc imprimis observare oportet, neque fla-

§ Regist. Cranm. fol. 188.  
bern. pag. 148.

§ Waræus de Præsul. Hi-



tuta regni, neque canones ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, Henrico Octavo regnante, aliquem permisisse in episcopum consecrari, nisi à tribus aut pluribus episcopis. Hoc adeò certum est, ut vel ipsi nostri adversarii liberè agnoscant. Hæc jura sub illius imperio unquam fuisse violata, nemo hætenùs dixerit. Si igitur constet Barlovium etiam illis temporibus, non minùs quàm sub Elizabetha postea manus suas episcopis consecrandis publicè imposuisse: Si consecrationes sic ab illo cum duobus aliis episcopis factæ, ab archiepiscopo acceptæ, à rege ipso approbatæ fuerint; quis dubitabit Barlovium cum hoc fecerit absque omni controversia, fuisse consecratum; neque aliter ei permisum fuisse alios episcopos sacrare, nisi ipse priùs fuerat sacratus?

Hic itaque registrum Cranmerianum appello. Consecrandus in episcopum Bangoriensem Arthurus Bulkleyus anno 1541, commissionem ab archiepiscopo obtinuit, Johanni Sarisberienti episcopo datam, ad consecrandum & benedicendum dominum episcopum electum & confirmatum: <sup>h</sup> “ Accitis, *inquit*, vobis aliis quibuscvis episcopis, five suffraganeis, executionem officii sui obtinentibus, in numero competenti & requisito; vobis in hujusmodi ministeriis assistentibus, & congruè opitulantibus, vobis tenore præsentium vices nostras committimus, & plenam in Domino concedimus potestatem.”

Hujus commissionis vigore, die dominicâ 19 Febr. A. D. 1541. “ In capella infra ædes venerabilis viri Johannis Incent LL. D. decani ecclesiæ cathedralis divi Pauli London, reverendus Pater Dom. Johannes Sarum episcopus, assidentibus sibi & comministrantibus reverendis patribus, dominis Rev. Menevensi (scilicet Barlovio) & Johanne Gloucestrensi episcopis, munus consecrationis & benedictionis domino Arthuro Bangoriensi electo & confirmato impendebat, in forma ecclesiæ Anglicanæ solita &

<sup>h</sup> Regist. Cranm. fol. 277. 6.

“ consueta,

### 394 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

“ consueti, in præsentia mei Anthonii Huse notarii  
“ publici, &c.”

Hanc consecrationem archiepiscopus ratam habens, Regi certificavit, eam rex suo calculo approbavit. Alias ejusdem consecrationes post sacratum ab illo Parkerum prætereo, in reverendissimi archiepiscopi registro extantes: sufficiat hoc tam claro exemplo, ex actis publicis deprompto, demonstrasse Barlovium alios episcopos consecrandi jus habuisse (sic enim verba illa archiepiscopi planè affirmant: “ executionem officii sui obtinentibus; ”) ac proindè illum absque omni dubio fuisse in episcopum consecratum.

Fuit igitur Barlovius, tum cùm episcopum hunc Bangorensem sacrauit, ipse procudio consecratus; ac proindè cum octo post annis ab <sup>i</sup> Edwardo Sexto ab ecclesia Menevensi ad Wellensem transferretur, nullum breve de significavit ad illum consecrandum emanasse invenitur, quod in omnibus aliis non consecratis pro more illius temporis perpetuò fieri consuevit.

Quod in promotione ejus ad episcopatum Wellensem factum fuisse diximus, in altera ejus translatione ab Elizabetha ad sedem Cicestrensem adhuc clariùs apparet. <sup>k</sup> Undecim illa graves atque eruditos viros ad varios regni episcopatus simul eligi curavit. Hos omnes utpotè adhuc in ordine tantùm sacerdotali constitutos, ab archiepiscopo confirmari & consecrari mandavit. Et ex ipsis actis publicis constat hos omnes fuisse confirmatos primùm, ac deindè in episcopos consecratos: Duos alios antea episcopos Barlovium atque Scoræum ad episcopatus Cicestrensem atque Herefordensem electos, tantùm confirmari jussit; & ex iisdem actis patet, hos duos confirmatos solummodò, non consecratos fuisse.

Quid de libro Brokesii scripserit Thomas Warde, aut de episcopis sub rege Edwardo VI. sacratis, mihi

<sup>i</sup> Rymer, vol. 15. p. 169. conf. p. 174.  
Episc. Angl. p. 18.

<sup>k</sup> Epist. de Succ.

nullatenùs est compertum. Id scio, istum, quicquid sit quod scripserit, à<sup>1</sup> Champnæo accepisse; qui rem pro solita sua, in hac controversia, fide narrat.

Miraris, vir prudentissime, & meritò miraris, aliquam hujusmodi sententiam (qualem narrat Champnæus) à *judicibus regni, sub ipsamet Elizabetha regina*, ferri potuisse, aut etiam relationem ejus cum permisso publicari. Sed salva res est; neque hîc ego tam falli Champnæum dico, quàm ea retulisse, quæ certò novit falsa omninò fuisse. Primò quippe, ut exinde incipiam, ait, *Judices regni sub ipsamet Elizabetha regina consecrationes episcoporum sub Edwardo factas in dubium vocasse*; & unius eorum, *Brokii* nimirum, auctoritate, hanc illorum dubitationem confirmat: cùm è contra certissimum sit, venerabilem illum virum mortem obiisse antequam Elizabetha regnare cœpit.<sup>m</sup> Testamentum quippe ejus insinuaturn fuit 12 die Octobris an. 1558. Maria autem vixit usque ad 17 diem Novembris proximè sequentis, cui deinde successit Elizabetha.

Secundò Brookius in Casibus suis Novellis, si Champnæo fides, hoc de Elizabethæ judicibus scripsit. At ipse collectionis illius titulus planè ostendit, Brookium illos Casus Novellos adeò non collegisse, ut ferè triginta post obitum ejus annis, ab alio, nescio quo authore, ex ejus libro excerpti fuerint. Liber sic inscribitur: *Ascuns novell cases de les ans & temps le Roy Hen. VIII, Ed. VI, & la Roygne Mary escrie ex la graund abridgment composed par Sr. R. Brooke Chivaler, &c. London. 1587.*

Atque hinc denique apparet, quomodo tota hæc res se habuerit. D. Robertus Brookius capitalis justitiarius fuit sub regina Maria, vir in legibus nostris eruditus, sed pro ratione illorum temporum, contra reformatos avitæ religionis propugnator acerrimus. Li-

<sup>1</sup> De vocat. Minist. pag. 452.  
part. I. col. 89.

<sup>m</sup> Wood's Athen. Oxon.



### 396 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

brum hic utilissimum composuit, post mortem ejus hoc titulo editum; *La graund abridgment collect & escrie per le judge tres reverend Sir Rob. Brooke Chivaler, nudgairs Chiefe Justice del Common Banke.* In illo libro sub certis capitulis totam illam partem legis nostræ municipalis digessit, quæ pendet vel à sententiis per judices latis, vel à responsis & argumentis jurisprudentum, quæque tum demùm vim legis obtinere censentur, cùm nulla lex scripta occurrit, ex qua judicium in causa aliqua ferri possit: Opus laboris maximi, nec minoris utilitatis. Ex hoc corpore juris ab illo collecti casus quosdam Novellos excerpfit anonymus quidam temporibus Henrici VIII. Edwardi VI. & Mariæ Reginae agitados: Et ne de annis, quibus illa quæ ab ipso referuntur, vel discussa, vel judicata fuerint, dubitetur, ad suos quæque reges & annos regnorum singula retulit. Casus hic allegatus sub regina Maria collocatur, annoque regni ejus secundo, num. 463, ut verè à Champnæo citatur; qui tamen pro summa sua fide, ad judices regni sub Elizabetha regina eum refert. In illa collectione nihil de suo profert hujus compendii author: verba tantùm Brookii exscribit; sed neque ipse Brookius aliud egit, quàm ea literis mandare, quæ in actionibus coram judicibus regni, vel ab ipsis decreta fuerant, vel à jurisconsultis allegata.

Verba Brookii ita se habent: *Dicitur q' Evesque in tempore Ed. VI. ne fueront sacres, & ideo ne fuer' Evesque, & ideo lease pur sans p' tielz & confirme p' le deane & chaptr' ne lier le successor, car tiels ne unq' fuer' evesque contra de evesque deprive q' fuit evesque in fait tempore dimissionis p' confirmationem factam. Nota diuſitie. (2 Marie.*

Atque hæc, si Champnæo credamus, fuit judicium regni eo tempore sententia. Utinam profectò sic se res habuisset! Inuictissimum id nobis præberet argumentum pro consecratione Barlovii tantoperè controversa: Qui cum magnam terrarum partem episcopatus sui Wellensis alienaverit, tamen neque locationes  
neque

neque alienationes ejus successor ipsius Bournius, (qui in recuperandis episcopatus sui redditibus sedulam aliàs atque laudabilem operam posuit) in dubium vocavit. Neque credibile est protectorem regni Seymerum, cujus usui hæ concessiones factæ fuerint, debitam curam non adhibuisse, ut ab homine fierent, quem certò noverit jus alienandi atque elocandi habuisse.

At verò planè apparet hanc non fuisse judicum regni sententiam. Nulla hîc ut in aliis illius relationibus nota occurrit, unde nobis constare possit, vel unum aliquem è judicibus sic dixisse. Aliter omninò sese exprimit Brookius in iis casibus, ubi judicum opiniones, aut curiæ sententiam refert. In hoc ipso titulo, judicum sententias à jurisperitorum opinionibus clarè distinguit. Paucis exemplis rem manifestam efficiam. Nota, inquit, per *Tibeb: Shelley, & Balduin Justices*: n. 2. per *totam curiam*: n. 1. per *Tibz & Brook Justic.* sic; *Pollard Justice & Brudnel Chief Justice*, contra: n. 13. per *touts les Justices de Banke le loy.* n. 15. per *opinionem curiæ*, n. 18. per *curiam*, n. 29. *curia* concessit. n. 30. per *omnes justitiarios.* n. 58. per *Hales Justice*, & plures alios, n. 62. At verò in casu allegato, præter unicum illud, *dicitur*, nihil apponitur. Nullum hîc curiæ judicium, nulla vel unius judicis opinio: etiam hanc rem prorsùs indecisam fuisse relictam, ex iis quæ de Ridleii locationibus contra eundem Champnæum jam observare libet, mihi plusquam verisimile viderur. Illius causa sic se habet.

Bonnero <sup>n</sup> episcopatu Londinensi per commissarios regios judicialiter amoto, an 1549, paucis post mensibus Ridleius Roffensis episcopus in ejus locum successit. Mariâ rerum potitâ, ad episcopatum suum Londinensem restitutus est Bonnerus, & sive cupidine vindictæ inflammatus, sive pecuniæ amore abreptus, locationes omnes à prædecessore suo factas, tanquam irritas, & de jure nullas rescindere conatus est. Hac occasione inter <sup>o</sup> Car & Letchmore de manerio de

<sup>n</sup> Rymer, t. 15. p. 222.

<sup>o</sup> Strype Memor. Eccles. vol. 3. p. 58.  
Bushley

398 RECORDS *and* INSTRUMENTS

Bushley orta lis est, quod priori concesserat Ridleius, posteriori Bonnerus. De consecratione Ridleii in tota actione nulla mentio. In eo causæ momentum constituebatur, quòd Bonnerus episcopatu Londinensi injustè fuerat deprivatus: Quòd Ridleius tanquam alieni juris invalor amotus fuerat; & Bonnerus in integrum restitutus; ac proindè quicquid Ridleius, utpote malæ fidei possessor, elocaverat, omni juris vigore destitueretur.

Summâ contentione causâ utrinque acta est, iudicesque credebantur in Bonneri favorem propendere: sed re tandem ad curiam cancellarii perductâ, ibique rursus auditâ, pro locationibus Ridleii decretum est: Et quamvis amici Bonneri sedulam operam navarent, ut supremâ parliamenti autoritate concessionem Ridleii irritæ pronuntiarentur, nihil obtinuerunt, neque aliquid ampliùs ea in re factum fuisse comperimus.

Atque hinc patet consecrationem Ridleii nullâ sententiâ judiciali in foro civili (neque enim jam de censuris à commissariis ecclesiasticis in deprivationibus horum episcoporum prolatis agimus) irritam vel habitam vel pronunciatam fuisse. Ad reliquos episcopos quod attinet; illud imprimis certum est, omnes ab Edwardo VI. creatos, nostro saltem more fuisse sacros: Consecrationes eorum, ne uno quidem excepto, in Cranmeri registro usque ad hunc diem inveniuntur. De modo ac forma qua consecrabantur, satis alibi dictum. Nos utrumque asserimus, neminem scilicet Edwardo regnante ad munus episcopi absque præviâ consecratione fuisse admissum; eorumque consecrationes ritè ac validè factas, neque aliquibus adversantium exceptionibus ullatenùs convelli posse.

Quod ad consecrationem Barlovii spectat, jam ostendi quæ fuit legum nostrarum cura, ne quis officium episcopi usurpet, nisi priùs ad illius exercitium consecratus. Unicam adhuc hujus disciplinæ nostræ  
confir-



confirmationem hîc adjiciam, ut planè perspicias Barlovium haudquaquam potuisse ad episcopatum Wellensem promoveri, si vel minimus eo tempore scrupulus aliquorum animos subierat, eum non fuisse in episcopum legitimè sacratum.

Prodiit eo ipso anno quo Barlovius ad episcopatum Wellensem transferebatur, novum pontificale ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, regia autoritate reformatum. In illo, ante omnia, expressè declaratur, quòd ab ipso apostolorum ævo semper in ecclesia fuerant hi tres ordines episcoporum, presbyterorum, & diaconorum : Quòd hi ordines adeò sacri semper habiti fuerint, ut nemo alicujus eorum officium exercere ausus sit, nisi priùs vocatus, probatus, examinatus ; & sic denique per manuum impositionem ad id admissus esset : Ac proindè ab ecclesia Anglicana requiri, ut nemini qui non antea consecratus fuisset, aliquod horum officiorum exequi liceret, nisi ad id vocetur, probetur, examinetur, & denique formâ in eo libro præscriptâ admitatur. Hoc jus fuit & regni & ecclesiæ, cum Barlovius factus est episcopus Wellensis. Quis credet ipsi soli hanc prærogativam fuisse concessam, ut absque ulla vocatione, probatione, examinatione, aut admissione, episcopi officium usurparet ? Quisve sanus dixerit eum, si sic fecisset, a nullo mortalium, amico, inimico, fuisse correptum ?

Nº. IX.

*A paragraph expung'd by the author's direction in the third Chapter, because he believ'd the argument not conclusive : There is another inserted in the room of it in P. 54.*

II. **L**A liberté que se donnent quelque fois les rois d'Angleterre de dispenser de la loi, qui defend d'accorder aux evêques l'investiture du temporel de leurs evêchez avant leur consecration, nous empêche  
de

de regarder comme démonstratif l'argument qu'on pourroit tirer en faveur de la consecration de Barlow, de ce que le temporel de l'évêché de S. David lui a été delivré dès le 26 Avril 1536. Mais comme nous ne trouvons point qu'il ait été sur cela dispensé de la loi commune, on peut du moins tirer de cette concession un argument probable en faveur de sa consecration. Car il est certain que la loi & l'usage ordinaire d'Angleterre est de ne mettre les évêques en possession des biens temporels de leur eveché, qu'après leur consecration. Le Statut passé la 25. an. de Henry VIII. pour regler l'élection des évêques, qui se trouvera dans nos preuves, le suppose ouvertement. L'auteur de la Police de l'Eglise Anglicane le dit encore bien plus positivement, & marque même dans quel ordre tout se faisoit à l'égard des évêques, soit pour leur election, soit pour ce qui la devoit suivre. *Postquam regis licentia & mandato, dit cet auteur, episcopi in Anglia à decano & capitulo cathedralium ecclesiarum infra dioceses quibus præficiendi sunt eliguntur; illius assensu electi comprobantur, comprobati confirmantur, confirmati consecrantur, & cum consecrati homagii juramentum regi præstiterint, & rex illis vicissim suorum episcopatum possessiones restituerit, in ipsa republica Anglicana non aliquâ à Christo delegatione—sed liberâ principum donatione his honoribus potiuntur.* Polit. Eccles. Ang. cap. 5. p. 39. Il y a dans le Recueil de Rymer cent preuves de ce qu'avance cet auteur. On y trouve quantité d'actes d'investiture, où la consecration est ordinairement exprimée, où du moins sous-entendue; & cette riche collection nous en fournit très peu de la prise de possession du temporel avant la consecration, ou l'installation, lorsque ce n'étoit qu'une translation. \* Or nous avons l'acte d'investiture du temporel de l'évêché de S. David donné par Henry VIII. à Barlow dès le 26 Avril 1536, où nous voyons le certificat de son installation;

\* Vindic. Ecc. Ang. p. 365.

& nous ne trouvons point qu'il ait, en sur cela aucune dispense ou aucun privilege du prince, pour se soustraire a la loi commune. Il y a donc beaucoup d'apparence qu' avant le 26 Avril 1536, il avoit été sacré, comme le supposent Camden, Godwin, Wharton, & tous les ecrivains qui ont touché quelque chose qui ait rapport a cette histoire.

Nº. X.

*The title of the fifteenth Chapter was thus in the French Edition.*

SUITE du même sujet. On fait voir combien les principes rapportez ci-devant, ont varié, & l'on examine à quoi on pourroit se reduire, pour avoir une regle certaine de conduite en cette matiere.

Nº. XI.

*This following passage the author has thought fit to expunge, and to insert another in the room of it, lest he should be thought to espouse Mr. Thorndike's principles about Re-ordination, which he does not.*

R IEN n'est moins surprenant, si cette question est regardée, comme une question de discipline, comme quelques anciens ont semblé la regarder, & comme d'habiles modernes la regardent encore. Car dans cette hypothese, comme il n'y a rien de fixe sur cela, & que la discipline varie selon les differentes conjunctures on se trouve l'eglise, il est aise de concilier toutes les contradictions apparentes qui se rencontrent; & l'on n'est point obligé, pour tout rapporter à un systême arbitraire, de forcer tons les faits, & de tout entendre dans un sens que la force des termes n'emporte point.



Mais en supposant même que cette question n'appartient point proprement à la discipline, il s'agit de sçavoir, si on ne pourroit point trouver un principe qui servit de regle en cette matiere, en sorte qu'on pût à la faveur de cette regle, decider tout d'un coup de la validité ou de l'invalidité d'une ordination. Or tel est, ce semble, celui, que nous proposons un sçavant theologien Anglois, nomme Herbert Thorndik, dans vn livre intitulé: *De Jure Finiendi, &c.* & qui emporteroit avec l'eclaircissement de toutes les difficultez. C'est aux lecteurs à en juger.

*Here followed a passage out of Mr. Thorndike; which I omit, it being already inserted in CHAP. XV. in its proper place.*

Ce passage est un peu long: mais il étoit trop important pour être abrégé, & il merite bien qu'on y fasse quelques reflexions. 1. Il suppose avec S. Leon, que deux choses sont necessaires pour la validité de l'ordination, le rit prescrit, soit par J. C. soit à son défaut par l'eglise, & l'autorité de l'eglise, *authoritatem ac jus ecclesiæ, tum consecrationis solennitatem*; & cet article ne doit point paroître extraordinaire, puisqu'en effet on ne croit qu'un sacrement conferé dans l'heresie est valide, que parce qu'on suppose que ce qui se fait dans l'heresie, est une suite du pouvoir de l'eglise, que l'erreur ne sçauroit suspendre. Mais si la profession de l'erreur ne sçauroit suspendre le pouvoir de l'eglise, l'eglise elle-même ne peut-elle pas arrêter son propre pouvoir, & ne point reconnoître pour son ouvrage, ce qui se seroit fait hors de son sein? L'auteur le soutient, & je ne sçai par où on pourroit le contester.

2. Si selon l'auteur, ces deux choses sont également necessaires; comme il est certain que l'omission du rit aneantit le sacrement, le défaut de l'autorité de l'eglise doit produire le même effect par une consequence necessaire; & cela se peut comprendre aisément

ment par la comparaison du mariage, où en vain employe-t-on la matiere la forme, si les loix de l'eglise & de l'etat sont violées; puisque par le défaut d'autorité, le mariage est nul, de l'aveu de tous nos theologiens. *Non Deo ritè sacratum videri debet, quod non sit jure ecclesiæ Deo sacratum, etsi servato ritu ecclesiæ.*

3. On conçoit ainsi aisément, comment une ordination, d'invalidé qu'elle étoit, peut devenir valide ensuite, sans que rien de sensible y intervienne de nouveau. Car le rit essentiel ayant été administré, l'eglise qui d'abord, en refusant son consentement, empêchoit que ce sacrement n'eût son effet, levant ensuite cet empêchement par le consentement qu'elle restituë, fait que rien ne manque plus au sacrement pour le rendre valide. *Itaque si dubium existat de auctoritate ecclesiæ, non de ritu ordinandi, non est mirum, accedente auctoritate ecclesiæ, valere ordinationem non jure factam, ad id ad quod valere eam vult accedens auctoritas ecclesiæ.*

4. Rien ne semble plus propre à expliquer tous les faits rapportez ci-dessus, & les variations qu'on a remarquées dans l'eglise sur cette matiere: car des là qu'on admettra pour principe, que l'autorité de l'eglise est aussi essentielle à la validité du sacrement, que l'usage de la matiere & de la forme, il ne doit être suprenant que quelques ordinations n'aient point été jugées valides, & qu'on ait reçu les autres; l'eglise ayant bien voulu par condescendance reconnoître les unes; & ne point admettre les autres par severité, ou par des raisons de prudence. *Non est mirum, accedente ecclesiæ auctoritate, ratas ordinationes evadere eas, quæ non accedente ecclesiæ auctoritate irritæ erant.* Au contraire, si l'on admet ce principe, la conciliation de ces faits est entièrement impossible: *Conciliandorum sibi invicem ecclesiæ decretorum, & gestorum rationem inibimus, frustra, hæc repudiata, quærendam.*

5. On leve par ce principe toute l'ambiguité, & il ne reste plus aucun scrupule; parce que la déclaration de l'eglise sur le fait des ordinations contestées,

# 404 REASONS *why* our AUTHOR

decidera tout d'un coup si elles sont valides ou non, & qu'on ne sçauroit s'abuser en s'en rapportent à son jugement: *Statuendum est non posse fidelibus fraudi esse ea apud Deum, in quibus sequuntur fidem ecclesiæ.* Cela suppose toujours qu'il est certain que la matiere & la forme n'ont point été omises; & en ce cas, on ne peut nier que la regle la plus certaine & la moins équivoque, ne soit de s'en rapporter à l'église.

6. Il est vrai qu'il ne paroît pas que dans l'affaire du baptême des hérétiques on ait raisonné sur ce principe. *Scio aliter decretum esse de baptismo hæreticorum — sed hoc ad ordinationem trahendum non est — nec est necesse ratam hæreticorum confirmationem concedere, quorum ratus sit baptismus; multò minùs ordinationem.* Mais aussi est-il certain que chez les anciens on ne raisonnoit pas toujours de même de ces deux sacremens, & que sur le fait de l'ordination, ils ne se feroient pas écarter de la pensée de l'auteur.

En effet il semble que S. Leon ait remis la validité de l'ordination au bon plaisir & à l'autorité de l'église, comme il le marque dans la lettre à Rustique de Narbonne. *Si qui autem clerici, dit ce grand Pape \* ab ipsis pseudo-episcopis in eis ecclesiis ordinati sunt, qui ad proprios episcopos pertinebant, & ordinatio eorum consensu & judicio præsentium facta est, potest rata haberi: ita ut in ipsis ecclesiis perseverent. Aliter autem vana habenda est creatio, quæ nec loco fundata est, nec authore munita.*

C'est là précisément tout le système de l'auteur, & ce n'est que parce que ce principe n'apas été assez connu, qu'on voit si peu d'uniformité dans tout ce qui concerne cette matiere.

Enfine, par ce principe l'église, comme il paroît fort raisonnable, suspendroit ou arrêteroît à son gré le progrès & la succession de toutes les sectes; puisque le ministère n'ayant point de validité sans son consentement, & aucune secte ne pouvant subsister sans

\* Leo Mag. ep. 2. inquis. 1.



ministres, le refuse qu'elle feroit de donner son consentement pour la validité du ministere, fapperoit toutes ces sectes par le fondement, & les anéantiroit entierement.

C'est aux lecteurs à juger si ce principe a autant de solidité qu'il paroît avoir d'avantages; & s'il est permis de l'adopter, en voyant qu'on ne s'en est jamais servi dans l'église, pour expliquer la difficulté dont il est question. Ce qu'il y a de certain, c'est que tous ceux qui ont contesté la validité de quelques sacremens, ont semble le supposer: mais les raisonnemens de leurs adversaires en ont toujours supposé un contraire. Au reste, ce qui résulte de tout ceci, c'est qu'il y a eu peu d'uniformité dans l'église sur cette matiere; & que si le principe reçu jusqu'ici dans toutes les ecoles catholiques a lieu, on ne peut contester aux Anglois la validité de leur ordination.

7. Ajouterai, en finissant, que l'adoption que l'on pourroit faire de cette maxime dans la suite, ne pourroit en rien déroger à la validité des ordinations Anglicanes, qui ont précédé; parce que ces sortes de maximes n'ont point de pouvoir rétroactif, & que cela ne pourroit avoir lieu que pour la suite, si un concile general, ou l'église en corps, s'accommodoit d'un tel principe.



# T H E C O N T E N T S.

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| <b>T</b> HE <i>Author's Preface.</i>  | Page 1 |
| <i>The Memoir of Mr. L'abbe Renaudot upon the Validity of the English Ordinations.</i>  | 10     |
| Chap. I. <i>An history of the changes that happen'd in England, since the Reformation, in the administration of orders.</i>   | 17     |
| Chap. II. <i>An history of the Ordination of Parker by Barlow; The authentickness of the record wherein it is register'd, and the falshood of the stories publish'd on that occasion.</i> | 26     |
| Chap. III. <i>Barlow, Parker's Consecrator, was himself consecrated: Proofs of this Consecration.</i>   | 48     |
| Chap. IV. <i>An answer to the reasons alledg'd on the other side: the publick instruments prove nothing against Barlow's Consecration.</i>  | 61     |
| Chap. V. <i>Boner's threat of Excommunication is chimerical; and were it real it proves nothing against Barlow's Consecration.</i>  | 81     |
| Chap. VI. <i>There was no essential defect either as to matter or form in the Consecration of Arch-Bishop Parker.</i>   | 89     |
| Chap. VII. <i>A Continuation of the same subject; an answer to some difficulties. I. The alterations made by King</i>   | King   |



# The CONTENTS.

- King Charles II. in the ordinal of King Edward VI. are no proof there was any essential defect in Parker's Ordination.* 104
- Chap. VIII. *An answer to the second difficulty. The form of Ordination prescrib'd by King Edward VI. was not prohibited by law when Parker was consecrated.* 117
- Chap. IX. *An answer to the third difficulty. Heretical opinions of those employ'd to draw up the ordinal for Consecration, establish'd by King Edward VI. are not sufficient to invalidate the Consecrations perform'd according to that ordinal.* 146
- Chap. X. *An inquiry into the power of a national church in the administration of the Sacraments; and whether by the changes she makes in the form of their Administration they lose their Validity, when even the alterations were not made till after her falling into schism or heresy.* 161
- Chap. XI. *An answer to the fourth difficulty. That it was not by the secular but by the ecclesiastical authority that the English ordinal was alter'd.* 197
- Chap. XII. *An answer to the fifth difficulty: the doubts of those divines, who look upon the English Ordinations as null, are not sufficient to make them dubious, nor consequently invalid.* 216
- Chap. XIII. *An answer to the sixth Difficulty. The Re-ordination of some English Bishops proves not that there was any thing essential wanting in their first Ordination.* 246
- Chap. XIV. *A Continuation of the same subject: the re-ordaining of the English is contrary to all the receiv'd principles maintain'd in the schools upon the subject of Re-ordinations.* 262
- Chap. XV. *A continuation of the same subject: how much the church has varied with respect to Re-ordinations. Reflections on a principle propos'd by Mr. Thorndike to fix these variations, and to regulate this matter. It is not upon this principle that the*  
church



# The CONTENTS.

*church hitherto has regulated her conduct on this head.*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <i>Chap. XVI. The succession of the English Bishops has not been interrupted by the schism.</i> | 282 |
| <i>Chap. XVII. The conclusion and recapitulation of this treatise.</i>                          | 296 |
|   | 310 |

Proofs justifying the facts advanc'd in the foregoing treatise.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No. I. <i>A letter from the late Mr. J. Ben. Bossuet Bishop of Meaux to D. John Mabillon.</i>                        | 319 |
| N. II. <i>Extracts from several acts of Parliament refer'd to in this work.</i>                                      | 321 |
| N. III. <i>Alterations made in the English ordinal under Charles II.</i>   | 333 |
| N. IV. <i>A general power given by Pope Julius III. to Cardinal Pole to reconcile England to the church of Rome.</i> | 337 |
| N. V. <i>A collection of records relating to Arch-Bishop Parker.</i>   | 344 |
| N. VI. <i>Attestations against the Fable of Parker's Consecration at the Nags-head.</i>                              | 356 |
| N. VII. <i>Records concerning Bishop Barlow.</i>   | 361 |
| N. VIII. <i>Fragments of letters written to Mr. Cou-<br/>rayer.</i>  | 372 |
| N. IX. <i>A paragraph expung'd out of this edition by the author.</i>  | 399 |
| N. X. <i>The author disclaims his concurrence with Mr. Thorndike's sentiments.</i>                                   | 401 |

